



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 147

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 31, 2001

No. 13

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

Chaplain Steven Colwell, Army Reserve Readiness Training Center, Fort McCoy, Wisconsin, offered the following prayer:

Our most gracious Heavenly Father, we thank You for giving us this day, another day of life for us to cherish Your goodness and Your majesty. May we use this day seeking Truth and in so doing return it as our gift to You.

O Lord, bless these gathered here with Your wisdom. Guard them and guide them, O Father, and fill them with Your Presence. Bless their families and the staffs that labor by their side in government. May the laws enacted here conform to the Great Law that emanates from Your righteousness. I beseech You, Lord, to hear this prayer, prayed by a simple soldier, offered to You in the Name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. LAMPSON led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

CHAPLAIN STEVEN COLWELL

(Mr. KIND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Speaker for the opportunity to say a few words about our guest chaplain today. I am proud that the inspiring words heard this morning came from one of my constituents, Chaplain Steven Colwell. He serves as staff minister at the Army Reserve Readiness Training Center at Fort McCoy, Wisconsin.

At Fort McCoy, Chaplain Colwell is the primary instructor on ethics and Army values training. In addition, he provides spiritual guidance and counseling to the more than 100,000 soldiers who come to Fort McCoy to train every year. The support that Chaplain Colwell provides to the military personnel and their families is invaluable. Chaplain Colwell has received numerous military honors, including the Army Commendation Medal with two Oak Leaf Clusters, the Kuwait Liberation Medal, and the South West Asia Service Medal with three Bronze Stars.

Chaplain Colwell has provided tremendous service to his community as well as our country. I am fortunate to have him as a constituent and pleased that he could share his inspiring words with us today. I thank Chaplain Colwell for being here today and for his service and dedication to our country.

APPOINTMENT AS INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule II, the Speaker, majority leader, and minority leader jointly appoint Mr. Steven A. McNamara of Sterling, Virginia, to the position of Inspector General for the United States House of Representatives for the 107th Congress, effective January 3, 2001.

MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY

(Mr. WELLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, let me ask a question of fairness and that is a pretty fundamental issue of fairness and that is, is it right, is it fair, that under our Tax Code that married working couples pay higher taxes just because they are married? Is it right, is it fair, that two working people, a husband and wife, both in the workforce, pay on average \$1,400 more in higher taxes just because they are married, \$1,400 more than an identical couple that lives together outside of marriage?

I think we all agree that it is wrong that 26 million married working couples on average pay \$1,400 more just because they are married. It is called the marriage tax penalty.

I was proud that this House and the Senate last year sent to the President legislation with bipartisan support wiping out the marriage tax penalty for almost everyone who suffers it. Unfortunately, it fell victim to the President's veto. Well, we have an opportunity this year to eliminate the marriage tax penalty, an opportunity to work together in a bipartisan way and send to our new President, President Bush, who indicates he will sign into

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H113

law our efforts to eliminate the marriage tax penalty, to get the job done this year.

I want to extend the invitation to my colleagues to join with us to eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

INTERNATIONAL ABDUCTIONS

(Mr. LAMPSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today for the first time to address the 107th Congress. Representing southeast Texas has been an honor and a privilege, and I look forward to two more years of service.

My grandson Nicholas joined me at the swearing-in ceremony this year and that was great; but unfortunately, there are many grandparents and parents who have not been so lucky and do not have the opportunity to share their lives with their children and grandchildren.

During my first year in office, I founded the Congressional Missing and Exploited Children's Caucus in response to the abduction and murder of a 12-year-old girl in Friendswood, Texas. The devastation felt by her family and the determination of the volunteers who searched for her inspired me to found this caucus, which includes 138 members and provides a loud and unified voice for missing children within Congress.

Mr. Speaker, as we begin the first session of the 107th Congress, I ask my colleagues who are not already members of the caucus to join me and to encourage those who are already members to continue fighting with me for our children and for our families. Let us work together as parents, grandparents, and Members of Congress to keep our children safe.

BREAST AND CERVICAL CANCER TREATMENT ACT

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, last Congress the passage of the Breast and Cervical Cancer Treatment Act was a huge victory for women across our Nation. This legislation gives every State the option of providing lifesaving treatment to low-income women who have been diagnosed with breast or cervical cancer through the early detection screening program.

I congratulate the governor of my home State, Florida, Jeb Bush, who recognized the great benefits of this program early on. Governor Bush included almost \$13 million in his budget to provide cancer treatment to low- and moderate-income women. I hope that the governors and legislators in every State follow the example of our governor, Jeb Bush, and help give women a fighting chance at beating this treacherous disease.

I especially congratulate Jane Torres, Teresa Moran-Menendez, and all of the members of the Florida Breast Cancer Coalition who lobbied and worked tirelessly to make this happen. On behalf of Florida's women, I thank Governor Jeb Bush.

WHITE HOUSE WAS NOT THE ONLY AMERICAN INSTITUTION THAT WAS TRASHED

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, graffiti on the walls, furniture destroyed, doors glued shut, garbage in refrigerators. Sounds like Animal House, but I am talking about the Clinton White House. Now if that is not enough to wax your windows, former President Clinton has said, and I quote, he wants "a complete and thorough investigation into this crime at the White House." Beam me up. This is the same President that wanted no investigation into Chinese Communist cash being funneled to the Democrat National Committee, and we let him get away with it. Unbelievable.

Mr. Speaker, the White House was not the only American institution that was trashed. The Clinton administration not only trashed, they shredded our Constitution.

I yield back the garbage at the former Clinton White House.

ENVIRONMENTAL EXTREMISTS DRIVE UP COST OF UTILITIES

(Mr. DUNCAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, if people wonder why their utility bills have gone up so much lately, they need look no further than the environmental groups. Environmentalists protest and stop or delay and thus drive up the costs every time a company tries to produce more natural gas, coal, oil or lumber. As a recent column by Thomas Sowell pointed out, these groups have stopped California from building any new power plants for over a decade. Many lower-income and senior citizens are now having to choose between eating or paying their utility bills. Most of the, quote, credit for this belongs to environmental extremists. If our leaders do not soon realize how left-wing most environmentalists have become, it will soon wreck our economy.

NEW MEMBERS WELCOMED TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, because I represent the home jurisdiction of the

United States Congress, I want to personally welcome new Members of the House and my friends and colleagues from past years. Many of them will spend more of their time here than they will in their own home district. They should know something about the city, and there is a Dear Colleague coming to them which they may find useful.

The city has rapidly revitalized. After a period of financial crisis, it was the only city that had to carry State, county, and municipal functions. Ultimately, it had to have a control board like the boards they had in New York and Philadelphia and Cleveland and other cities, but on Monday after 4 years of balanced budgets and surpluses, indeed the end of the control period was announced 2 years ahead of time. We have been witnessing not only financial revival but the complete overhaul of services, enormous progress. The front page of the Washington Post talks about some of that progress today. If Members have service problems in their own home or in their own neighborhood, I hope they will be in touch with my office.

EVERY CHILD SHOULD HAVE A FIRST-CLASS EDUCATION

(Mr. FERGUSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, as a former teacher, I believe that our most profound responsibility is to ensure that every child has a first-class education, that no child is left behind, and that all students can share in the pride and promise of educational opportunity. That is why I am so pleased with the bipartisan support education reform is receiving from my colleagues in the House and in the Senate.

It is important that we continue to put our children above politics. I believe that while we call for higher standards, we must also provide schools with both the funding and the flexibility that they need to succeed. Flexibility is a key to success. After all, the needs of schools in Green Brook and Warren, towns in my district in New Jersey, are different from the needs of schools in Green Bay and in Wichita.

Targeting resources to local priorities will ensure that dollars reach the programs that need them the most, such as hiring new teachers to reduce class size, expanding charter schools and funding for new school construction.

I commend our President and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for advocating common sense education reforms that, if enacted, will strengthen our public schools and make sure that no child is left behind. After all, our children are our country's most precious resource.

MAKING IN ORDER MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULES ON TODAY

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker be authorized to entertain a motion to suspend the rules and agree to the following concurrent resolution today, January 31, 2001:

House Concurrent Resolution 15.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR AN ADJOURNMENT OF HOUSE FROM JANUARY 31, 2001 TO FEBRUARY 6, 2001

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 18) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 18

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Wednesday, January 31, 2001, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Tuesday, February 6, 2001.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record votes on postponed questions will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules.

PERMITTING USE OF ROTUNDA OF CAPITOL FOR CEREMONY AS PART OF COMMEMORATION OF DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE OF VICTIMS OF HOLOCAUST

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 14) permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance victims of the Holocaust.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 14

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the rotunda of the Capitol is authorized to be used on April 18, 2001, for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust. Physical preparations for the ceremony shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may prescribe.

□ 1015

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to the rule, the

gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY).

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Public Law 96-388, signed October 7 of 1980, and the original bill was introduced by the late Representative Sydney Yates, created the United States Holocaust Memorial Council. The council was charged with providing for appropriate ways for the Nation to commemorate the Days of Remembrance as an annual national civic commemoration of the Holocaust. As a result of this legislation, the first ceremony of remembrance was held in the rotunda in 1979 and has been held there every year since, except periods when the rotunda has been closed for renovations.

House Concurrent Resolution 14 will provide for this year's annual national ceremony to be held April 18 in the rotunda. That ceremony will be the centerpiece of similar remembrance ceremonies to be held throughout the Nation.

This is an important resolution, Mr. Speaker, in memory of, I think, one of the largest tragedies that the world has ever seen, and I urge that we support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am very pleased and proud to rise in support of this concurrent resolution that would grant the use of the Capitol rotunda for the 2001 Days of Remembrance Ceremony. I certainly want to thank the new chairman, and I want to congratulate him also, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), who has had a distinguished career in the State legislature, chaired the Committee on Appropriations in the Senate in Ohio and has come to the House and made an extraordinary contribution and has just been named as chairman of the House Administration Committee. I congratulate him and look forward to working with him. I want to congratulate the chairman for his hard work in getting this resolution to the floor today in a very timely fashion.

Mr. Speaker, this ceremony has occurred annually in the Capitol rotunda. It is the centerpiece of similar programs that occur all across our land. There is no doubt that the rotunda, the site of so many of our Nation's historical events, is a fitting and appropriate place for such a program. It is a place of unity, where we gather together as a Nation to celebrate and, yes, sometimes to mourn. On April 18, 2001, it will once again be at the forefront of the Nation's attention as we gather to remember one of the most heinous times in our past, and to pledge anew that it will never, never, never again happen, and that we will never, never again turn our backs on genocide.

The theme of this year's program is "Remembering the Past for the Sake of

the Future." This should be more than just a theme for a few days; it should be a guiding principle in all of our actions.

Sixty years ago the Nazis began their campaign of genocide against European Jews and others perceived to be not productive parts of the society. When the war finally ended, more than 11 million people, including 6 million Jews, died at the hands of the Nazis. In the years since, we have built memorials and museums so we can better remember, and this is certainly appropriate.

In remembering the past, however, we must always consider the future. This sentiment was perhaps best stated in the 1979 report of the President's Commission on the Holocaust that said, "A memorial unresponsive to the future would violate the memory of the past."

The Days of Remembrance program is a living remembrance of the past that should always help guide the future. It forces us to consider what we can do to prevent genocide from ever occurring again. It raises questions we often grapple with in the Congress. As we all know, Mr. Speaker, we grappled with it in Bosnia, in Kosovo. So it is not ancient history; it is recent history.

What should we have done and what can we do in Rwanda, Afghanistan, the Sudan? Well, let us also use this opportunity to shine a light into the dark corners of our own Nation. In the past several years, we have seen a proliferation of hate crimes across our land. We must use the power that the people have granted us to pass laws to help ensure that these horrible acts will never go unpunished, or even perhaps more importantly, or as importantly, unrecognized.

As most of my colleagues know, the Days of Remembrance Commemoration was created in the establishment clause of the legislation that created the United States Holocaust Memorial Council. I would like to thank all of the members, Mr. Speaker, of the Council for their tremendous work that ensures that this Nation and our people will never forget and will never allow this tragic history to repeat itself.

I would also take a moment, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) has also mentioned him, to remember the late and great Member of this House who served almost a half a century, Sid Yates from Illinois. Sid Yates kept the faith. Sid Yates kept the light burning. Sid Yates made us all remember. Sid Yates was a giant in this institution, a giant in this country; and we miss him. This commemoration will certainly be another remembrance of him as well. Through Sid, though he is no longer with us, his efforts to ensure that current and future generations never forget the Holocaust will reverberate for years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken to my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), who is a strong

supporter of this resolution and a tireless advocate for human rights. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, he cannot be on the House Floor today and, therefore, is unable to support this resolution on the floor at this time. But as our ranking member on the Committee on International Relations, and I see we have the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) here, the chairman of the Committee on International Relations; the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) would join the chairman in support of this resolution. I would like to thank him for his continuing support.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, and I would also like to urge them to participate in this event, to remember the past, to reflect upon our obligation to the future.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I just want to take a second to also thank the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for his work on this important resolution and for his work on the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H. Con. Res. 14, sponsored by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) and by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER); and I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of this measure. I want to commend the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for his supportive comments and his tribute to former Congressman Sid Yates who did so much good work in reminding all of us about the importance to commemorate the Holocaust.

House Concurrent Resolution 14 permits the use of our congressional rotunda for the annual ceremony commemorating the Days of Remembrance of the victims of the Holocaust. The annual Days of Remembrance sponsored by our Nation's Holocaust Memorial Council, of which I am a congressional member, will take place this year on April 18. That important commemorative program allows our Congress and the Nation to appropriately observe the Days of Remembrance for victims of the Holocaust, to pay tribute to the American Army liberators of the concentration camp survivors. And by commemorating this enormous tragedy, we remind the world that we must not let it happen again anywhere in the world.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to adopt this important resolution, H. Con. Res. 14.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

(Mr. CANTOR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for House Concurrent Resolution 14, permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol to commemorate the Days of Remembrance of victims of the Holocaust.

The use of the Capitol rotunda for this occasion is a fitting tribute to the victims of the Holocaust, and I am proud that the United States Congress recognizes the importance of the lessons taught by their death and suffering. It is appropriate that we commemorate those who tragically lost their lives in the Holocaust. However, it is also important to note that the remembrance of this dark chapter of human history serves to remind us of what can happen when the fundamental tenets of democracy are discarded by dictatorial regimes.

While we in the United States, the birthplace of Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, have experienced years of peace and prosperity, we must not forget that genocide and human rights abuses continue to occur elsewhere around the world. As the leader of the Free World, the United States must use its power and influence to bring stability to the world and educate people around the globe about the horrors of the Holocaust to ensure that it must never happen again.

I am pleased that the growing number of community-based Holocaust museums around the country are a reflection of our increasing awareness of the lessons of the Holocaust. I am proud to be a founding trustee of the Virginia Holocaust Museum and applaud the efforts of those who join us nationwide in support of this noble cause. Only when every person understands the magnitude of the death, destruction, and utter horrors of the Holocaust can we feel we have done everything to prevent its recurrence.

Therefore, as we remember the horrors of this dark chapter in human history and remain dedicated to increasing awareness of the Holocaust, I am pleased to be here in support of this resolution regarding the use of the Capitol rotunda on this most solemn occasion.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support House Concurrent Resolution 14 to make use of the rotunda to commemorate the victims of the Holocaust. When we think about the Holocaust, we must understand the centrality of an individual people with their passions, dreams, aspirations, and agonies as being the voices that sear our conscience to honor righteousness and embrace a future of justice for all.

These voices strive to teach us that the Holocaust was not an abstract in-

justice that defiled, tortured and killed six million Jews, but a testament of faith that the origins of injustice are in the minds and hearts of men and women and that justice will come into the world only when the unjust persons change their ways in a move to love thy neighbor. If we refuse to hear these voices, we ourselves will be perpetual victims of our past and our inheritance. Let us not forget the victims of the Holocaust when we see the faces of desperate people.

Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted to add my voice to that of those who not only want to make use of the rotunda, but those who would want to share our expressions and feelings of concern for a tremendous tragedy that wrecked our world. I urge passage of this resolution.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding me this time, and I thank those who have offered this resolution.

I rise in support of the resolution providing for a ceremony in commemoration of the Days of Remembrance of the victims of the Holocaust. Out of this horrific and tragic story of life and death and the loss of so many loved ones in a tragedy in our world history comes an acknowledgment that we should never, never forget.

As my colleagues have indicated, the story of the Holocaust is more than the reciting of the tragedy of six million lives, not faceless human beings, but families, mothers and fathers, children, grandparents, all of whom lost their lives in the tragedy of extreme and brutal cruelty because they were different. So I believe what we are standing here today and supporting and continuing to remember is that we will be strong in supporting what is right, what is open, and what is fair and what is loving, and never, never forget what has been done from one human race to another.

□ 1030

I would offer to say that we should also raise up our prayers for peace in the Middle East and I offer my congratulations for this celebration.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to pay tribute to the Holocaust Museum in my city, the City of Houston, and thank them for what they have brought to our community, for they have taught us tolerance and peace and love, and I hope that we will continue that in this Nation.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the State of Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT).

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, in the history of the world, there are very few issues that strike us so hard as what went on during the Holocaust, but life goes on. I was noticing this

morning that 100,000 people have died in India in an earthquake, and it is off the front page of the New York Times. We pass on to the next event and the next event, and people tend to forget.

Mr. Speaker, and what is important, not only for us as human beings in the Congress, but for the American people and the world, to not forget is what happens if people who care are not vigilant. People who know what is going on must speak out. When I think about what will go on over there, I always think of the statement made by Martin Noemuller, who said, "When they came for the Communist, I was not a Communist, so I did not speak up. And when they came for the trade unionists, I was not a trade unionist, and so I did not speak up. And when they came for the socialist, I was not a socialist, and I was not a Jew. And when they came for me, there was nobody to speak up."

I think that the decision by the House of Representatives to take the time to make a day of remembrance in the Rotunda is a very small step towards helping us to remember.

We, all of us, know people whose families were affected by it, and when you listen to their stories, one of the things I do on the 4th of July is give a liberty award to the immigrant to our country who has done things for the people of Seattle. About 3 years ago, I gave an award to a woman who came, when all of her family was lost, she was the only one who came to the United States. She opened a successful business, but she spent all of her extra time and money educating people of Seattle about what this is about. And I think that the House is to be commended, the leadership is to be commended to put this first on the agenda. Because if we ever forget what our democracy is really all about, we are in danger of losing it.

Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to be rising in support.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN).

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have some pictures on the wall in my den, they were left to me by my mother, pictures of people that I never met. They are people in Europe, some of them in Poland, especially who my mother would refer to as her aunt so-and-so or her cousin so-and-so, people that she never saw again when she left Poland as a 6-year-old girl.

People who just disappeared and nobody knew what happened to them, but everybody knew, in reality, what happened to them. They had been rounded up, little kids, their parents, husbands and wives, separated in extermination camps, put into gas chambers and just changed into smoke.

The entire world, Mr. Speaker, stood by for so long during that period of time. People did not want to know. It was a catastrophe of just enormous proportions that at the end, there were

over 12 million people that were exterminated, 6 million of them Jews, Catholics, labor union workers, gypsies and others. Horrible experiments done on human beings just for the sadistic curiosity of so many physicians gone mad in Nazi Germany.

The world turned a blind eye. Oh, they had excuses. They did not know. They did not hear about it. When we think about it, Mr. Speaker, people disappearing in the middle of the night, half of towns just disappearing and others thinking, thinking that they better not speak up, lest something happen to them.

We must recognize this tragedy of all tragedies, Mr. Speaker. The action in the House today to make the Rotunda available for a commemoration of this terribly horrific event is something that we do with a great deal of sadness, but with the knowledge of knowing that if we did not take this kind of action to keep reminding the world that, indeed, these things do happen, that they can happen, and that there are good people who must and need to speak up, then we could never prevent this from happening again.

Mr. Speaker, I commend all of our colleagues who have spoken here today and all who have expressed their support for this resolution, and I thank the sponsors of the resolution for bringing it before us today.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN) for his very poignant and powerful comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my colleagues for their support in sponsorship of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, before my election to the House, I served as the President of the Institute on the Holocaust and the Law, and we studied and analyzed how laws were used not to protect people, but as instruments of oppression; how over 400 anti-Jewish laws were promulgated and formulated to discriminate, to segregate, to impoverish and to annihilate; how judges used the most murderous interpretation of law to impose death sentences for petty crimes; how law professors formulated lethal theories to advance a political agenda that discriminated against so many people.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is very fitting that we, as law-makers, be reminded of the unique role of law and the profound difference between law and justice.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, we should look upon the day of remembrance in the very same way that we look upon Martin Luther

King's birthday. We need to remember, because if we forget, we cannot be sure that sacrifices that were made will not have to be made again.

I went to school in segregated schools of the District of Columbia. It was not until I had the opportunity to go away to college that I actually learned that 6 million Jews had been murdered in World War II. I knew all about World War II, why did I not know about this sacrifice? That is what segregation and isolation from one another will do to you.

Mr. Speaker, I remember the day there in the dormitory when sitting around in an integrated group that I first learned, and it stuck me like a bolt of lightning. I could not believe it, well, believe it. Believe that anti-Semitism is still alive. Believe that it exists in all communities and in all races and in this country, and that there are still incidences every year reported in the North and the South and the East and the West, believe it.

So as we go to the day of remembrance in this great building, let us understand that we are not only remembering. We remember so that we will not forget for a reason, because these issues of racial and religious hatred do not die forever, and they need, each generation, to vivify what they can mean. So what we do on the day of remembrance and what we do here in this House is most appropriate, and if we think about our country and the world today, we will understand as well that it is most necessary.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my strong support for H. Con. Res. 14, to authorize the use of the Rotunda of the United States Capitol for the national civic commemoration of the Days of Remembrance of the Holocaust later this year. I want to express my thanks to the chairman of the Committee on House Administration, Mr. NEY of Ohio, for his leadership in this matter, and I also want to thank my dear friend and distinguished colleague Mr. HOYER of Maryland, the ranking Democratic member of the Committee.

Mr. Speaker, as the only survivor of the Holocaust ever elected to the Congress of the United States, this resolution has special meaning for me. Remembering the Holocaust on this day provides us the opportunity to pay tribute to the vast numbers of innocent men, women and children who were murdered en masse by the Nazi war machine and its Fascist allies. It also reminds us of man's mindless inhumanity towards man.

In the traumatic, final days of the Second World War, when the full horror of Hitler's "Final Solution" was brought to light, the international community said "never again." Looking back over the past fifty years since the Holocaust, this hope has, unfortunately, not been realized. Time and time again whole populations have been extinguished in southeast Asia, central Africa, southeast Europe and elsewhere as religious, ethnic and racial hatred ran amok. Innocent men, women, and children have been targeted for destruction for the sole reason that they were of a different religious, ethnic or racial community.

Mr. Speaker, this annual observance of the "Days of Remembrance" is a much-needed

reminder of the nightmare of the Holocaust and the massacre of 6 million innocent people by a brutal and barbaric regime. It also reminds us that hate persists in today's world, that hate crimes are prosecuted each and every day, and that we must do all in our power to prevent hate crimes from leading to future holocausts.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Concurrent Resolution 14, which would permit the use of the Capitol Rotunda for ceremonies commemorating the Days of Remembrance of the victims of the Holocaust. Holocaust Remembrance Days are specially designated periods of time during which victims of the Holocaust are cherished and remembered. Further, these days serve as reminders to all citizens that the evils of bigotry, hate, and indifference are very real, and continue to pose serious threats. Yet, it is in the remembrance of the Holocaust and the commemoration of those who perished that we overcome these evils and symbolize a voice that speaks for the very essence of humanity.

I can think of no better place than the Rotunda of the United States Capitol to capture the appropriate elements of reverence and dignity necessary for the remembrance of the victims of this tragedy. And it is with such remembrance that we allow individuals to be educated about the Holocaust so that future generations will know the horrors of violent indifference. The United States Capitol has stood as a symbol for freedom and liberty, a symbol that brilliantly reflects the positive aspects of this country. The Capitol may once again serve as such a symbol, and at this time may reflect the inspiration that has allowed the survivors of the Holocaust and the friends and family of survivors to truly survive, and will also join the battle against the greatest enemy to the remembrance of the victims of the Holocaust, silence.

Mr. Speaker, indifference is not neutral and is not unspoken. Indifference has a voice in the present and in the past. And as we move sixty years beyond the Holocaust, our obligation in honoring those who perished will live on and be fulfilled by telling their grim but inspirational story from the hall of our government reserved for the highest tribute, the Capitol Rotunda.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 14, which will allow the use of the Capitol Rotunda for an April 18th ceremony to pay tribute and respect for the victims of the Holocaust. This day will be a demonstration of respect and remembrance for the Jews and their families whose property was stolen, hopes and dreams suffocated, and lives extinguished in the Nazi death camps and throughout Nazi-ruled Europe.

We also come together to recognize that if we are ever to witness a universal respect for human rights, we must begin by acknowledging the truth: Even today, governments still continue to commit atrocities against their own citizens while escaping the consequences of their actions, internally by means of repression and externally for reasons of political expediency.

The events that took place under Nazi rule were real. Real people—women, children, the old, and the infirm—were wiped out. The sheer scope of the slaughter was and still is shocking. And yet when so many react with sil-

lence or indifference to genocidal horrors occurring today, in Rwanda, Congo, and Bosnia, we effectively give our approval to genocidal abuses of power.

We must all recognize that silence can not be acceptance when it comes to human rights abuses. Not just violations of the past, but also against violations which are occurring in our world today. We must let the truth about these events be known and continue to speak out against all instances of inhumanity.

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have come to the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives today to commend the authors of H. Con. Res. 14, legislation that will permit the use of the Capitol rotunda for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the Days of Remembrance of victims of the Holocaust.

I believe it is vital for the United States to continue to lead the way in the remembrance and prevention of crimes against humanity. And that is the exact purpose served by the legislation before us today, which will enable us to hold a solemn ceremony in the rotunda of the Capitol to remember the millions of victims of the Holocaust.

The important lesson learned by remembering the victims of the Holocaust is that man's inhumanity to man, if unchecked, can quickly result in the slaughter of millions of innocent people. Whether we honor the victims of the Holocaust at the U.S. Capitol, or whether we study the tragic story of other genocides, the universal lesson is that America has a national interest in assuring that the 21st century is not marred by genocide.

Mr. Speaker, over the past several months I have been honored to work with one of my constituents, Ms. Bonnie Glogover, of Edgewater, New Jersey in an effort to increase awareness about the Holocaust. Ms. Glogover, whose father is a survivor of Auschwitz, is working to see that Holocaust Remembrance Day is printed on calendars to educate the public about this important observance. Her unending dedication to this worthwhile cause is a tribute to our sworn duty to never forget, and I am proud to be associated with her in this endeavor.

This year, Holocaust Remembrance Day will be commemorated on April 19, 2001. I urge all my colleagues to inform their constituents of this and to join House and Senate leaders in the Capitol Rotunda this April to remember the innocent victims of the Holocaust.

I am honored to support H. Con. Res. 14 and I urge my colleagues to vote for this worthwhile legislation.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the sponsors and supporters of this resolution, permitting the use of the Rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the Days of Remembrance of Victims of the Holocaust.

Prior to being elected to this House, I served as president of the Institute on the Holocaust and the Law. The Institute studies and analyzed how laws were used in the Holocaust as instruments of oppression, rather than protection. How over 400 anti-Jewish decrees were promulgated and formulated to discriminate, segregate, impoverish and annihilate. How judges used murderous interpretation of legal theory to impose death sentences for petty crimes. How law professors formulated lethal theories to advance a political agenda that affected millions, Jews and gentiles alike.

I believe it is fitting that we, as lawmakers, be reminded of the unique role of the law in the Holocaust; and the profound and vast difference between law and justice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 14.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 14.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

EXPRESSING SYMPATHY FOR VICTIMS OF EARTHQUAKE IN INDIA ON JANUARY 26, 2001, AND SUPPORT FOR ONGOING AID EFFORTS

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 15) expressing sympathy for the victims of the devastating earthquake that struck India on January 26, 2001, and support for ongoing aid efforts.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 15

Whereas on the morning of January 26, 2001, a devastating and deadly earthquake shook the state of Gujarat in western India, killing untold tens of thousands of people, injuring countless others, and crippling most of the region;

Whereas the earthquake of January 26, 2001, has left thousands of buildings in ruin, caused widespread fires, and destroyed infrastructure;

Whereas the people of India and people of Indian origin have displayed strength, courage, and determination in the aftermath of the earthquake;

Whereas the people of the United States and India have developed a strong friendship based on mutual interests and respect;

Whereas India has appealed to the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, and the international community for the economic assistance to meet the substantial relief and reconstruction needs facing that country in the aftermath of the earthquake;

Whereas the United States has offered technical and monetary assistance through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID); and

Whereas offers of assistance have also come from the Governments of Turkey,

Switzerland, Taiwan, Russia, Germany, China, Canada, and others, as well as countless nongovernmental organizations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) expresses its deepest sympathies to the citizens of the state of Gujarat and to all of India for the tragic losses suffered as a result of the earthquake of January 26, 2001;

(2) expresses its support for—

(A) the people of India as they continue their efforts to rebuild their cities and their lives;

(B) continuing and substantially increasing the amount of disaster assistance being provided by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and other relief agencies; and

(C) providing future economic assistance in order to help rebuild Gujarat;

(3)(A) supports the economic assistance efforts of the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, and the international community; and

(B) urges the President to use United States influence with these bodies to expedite these efforts; and

(4) recognizes and encourages the important assistance that also could be provided by other nations to alleviate the suffering of the people of India.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 15.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 15, which expresses the sympathy and the condolences of the American people and the Congress of the United States following the devastating earthquake that struck western India January 26, 2001.

This earthquake, the most severe in India in the past 50 years, registered 7.9 on the Richter scale and caused incalculable human suffering and devastation. The resultant loss of life is estimated to be in the tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands are homeless and injured.

President Bush has pledged to provide immediate assistance to India, which is in urgent need of medical supplies, food, and emergency relief equipment.

H. Con. Res. 15 supports the efforts of our government, the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank and the international development community, in their endeavors to provide assistance to the Government of India and private voluntary organizations that are engaged in relief efforts.

Mr. Speaker, India is the most populous democracy on earth and a stra-

tegic partner of the United States. It is, therefore, fitting that the United States Congress express its sympathy and condolences to the people of India for the tragic loss of life and devastating destruction caused by this earthquake and support all bilateral and multilateral efforts to ease the human suffering in India and provide assistance in the reconstruction effort.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 15. I urge its adoption by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 15.

Mr. Speaker, on the morning of January 26, the devastating earthquake measuring 7.9 on the Richter scale ripped through Gujarat State in northwestern India, leaving in its wake destruction on a staggering scale. The full extent of the damage is as yet unknown, but the numbers of dead are at least in the tens of thousands, the number of injured in the hundreds of thousands, and the number of displaced is so far over a half a million.

The estimate of property damage now tops \$5 billion, but mere numbers cannot capture the extent of the devastation, nor the horror at the loss of life and loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express my personal condolences to all of those in India for the tragic losses that they have suffered.

□ 1045

I also want to express my condolences to those Indian-Americans whose families or friends have been affected by the earthquake. I know that the Indian-American community has mobilized since the earthquake to provide donations to those organizations that are assisting the relief operations on the ground in India, and the community should be commended for and assisted in its efforts.

The U.S. Agency for International Development has responded with a pledge of \$5 million in emergency assistance joining many other nations as the international community comes together to assist in the search and rescue effort.

I am sure that, in this hour of India's deepest need, the United States and the international community will continue to do all that they can to assist India in the rescue and reconstruction efforts.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us today expresses the deepest sympathies of the Congress to the people of India and expresses our support as the people of India begin to rebuild their lives. I urge all of our colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman

from California (Mr. ROYCE), one of the coauthors of this resolution.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the new chairman of the Committee on International Relations, especially for expediting this important resolution to make certain that it hit the floor today.

I worked on this resolution with the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT), my fellow cochairman of the Congressional Caucus on India; and it goes to the issue of the massive earthquake that with terrifying intensity hit the State of Gujarat in India on January 26. This is the most massive quake that India has faced in 50 years. It left in its wake tens of thousands of dead and injured. It devastated the infrastructure of the region.

The death toll has now been estimated anywhere between 20,000 and, incredibly, 100,000 human beings. These are staggering numbers, though the fatality statistics alone do not begin to convey the level of suffering that the people of India have endured and will endure for years to come as a result of this quake.

Indeed, the images of death and destruction we have seen on television are sobering. While the quake also impacted Pakistan and Nepal and Bangladesh, it is Gujarat that has been reduced to rubble. Thousands who have been left homeless must now deal with the loss of family members and the loss of their neighbors.

But in this tragedy, we were afforded a look at the strength of the human spirit. Alongside the devastation that occurred were the courage and determination shown by the people of India. Glimmers of that spirit came in the news that a mother and her baby were found among the survivors a full 4 days after the quake struck.

Offers of assistance have come from many countries. Not surprisingly, members of the Indo-American community have been quick to deliver their time and aid. Many Indo-Americans have family in Gujarat, though it is the Indo-American community as a whole that has stepped forward with a greatly impressive aid drive.

Over the weekend, USAID coordinated an airlift of emergency supplies to meet the immediate needs of the families in the region. President Bush has said that other airlifts are on the way. This resolution backs that effort in the strongest of terms which extends the American tradition of providing humanitarian aid.

The rebuilding of the state of Gujarat is a daunting challenge. Economic damage may top \$5 billion. While India enjoys a growing economy, U.S.-India commerce is growing, India is still, though, very much a developing country that can ill afford this damage, especially to Gujarat, which was an economic powerhouse of India.

But India has a strong partner in the United States. We can lend a hand. Indians and Americans share a strong

friendship, one that is so promising because of our common security and economic interest as well as the bond of common values between the world's oldest and largest democracies.

This quake, by the way, struck on India's Republic Day, a time for India to celebrate the democratic values upon which it was founded 51 years ago.

Again, I want to commend the effort of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) and applaud the support many Members of both parties showed by quickly cosponsoring this resolution. Showing solidarity now is in India's interest and it is in America's interest, and I urge passage.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. McDERMOTT), the cosponsor of the resolution before us and also the newly elected cochair of the Congressional Caucus on India and Indian-Americans.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H. Con. Res. 15, the concurrent resolution to express sympathy to the victims of the earthquake and the Indian state of Gujarat.

It is really with a very heavy heart that the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), my colleague and Indian Caucus cochair, has introduced this bill.

I went down to San Francisco on Friday to celebrate Republic Day with the Indian community. I have never been in such a sad place filled with people who had spent the day or the night trying to get through to find out if their families were still alive.

For those of us who live on the West Coast, a 7.9 earthquake is truly terrifying. I have never been through anything that strong, and I have been through some tough ones in Seattle, and I know the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) has in Southern California. The devastation was, of course, clearly going to be a bad earthquake. But no one realized that this was going to be the worst natural disaster in several centuries in India.

Several high-ranking government officials have already stated that the death toll is probably going to reach 100,000 people. Conservative estimates on property damage suggest a \$5.5 billion toll, and that is before there has really been an assessment of the problem.

This resolution simply expresses our sympathies and our support for efforts by our own country in relief efforts. The physical devastation of Gujarat will not be erased for many years, and the psychological scars may never be eliminated.

Gujarat is where Mahatma Gandhi came from. It is where independence sprang. His first nonviolent act was to walk from Ahmedabad, the city that was destroyed, down to the sea. This is a time of tragedy, then, for our friends in India and all its people. In recent years, we have grown increasingly closer to India. The President visited India. The Prime Minister visited the United

States last year. It was truly an amazing year last year. Those ties have become tighter and tighter in large measure because of the strong Indian-American community who has made an amazing impact in our country.

It has been this community that has come together to truly lead the American people's response to this natural disaster. I was in Seattle for the Republic Day celebration on Sunday, and they had already pledged a million dollars from Seattle.

India is a trading partner, a strategic partner and certainly an ally in democracy. I truly hope that our token of support is received by India and the people of India with our deepest sympathies.

This resolution, I am sure, will be unanimous on all sides of the aisle. I am happy this House has acted so quickly.

I want to thank Speaker HASTERT and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) for acting so quickly and especially to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for waiving their jurisdiction so that we can vote on it today.

I would like to close by offering a Sanskrit benediction: "Sarva Mangalam Bha-vantu," peace to everyone.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the distinguished chairman emeritus of the Committee on International Relations.

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), our distinguished chairman, for yielding. And I commend the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) for their sponsorship of this important resolution.

I am pleased to rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 15, a sense of the Congress expressing our sympathy for the victims of the recent tragic earthquake in India and support for our ongoing aid efforts. Our hearts and prayers go out to our friends and families both here and abroad who are anguishing and mourning over this enormous tragedy in India.

On January 26, a quake that hit India's Gujarat state measured 7.9 on the Richter Scale. As of yesterday, there were 6,287 people confirmed dead and 15,481 injured, with estimates putting the total number of fatalities projected to be as high as 100,000. That earthquake left thousands of buildings in ruin, caused widespread fires and devastation and impacted the entire infrastructure of that region.

My office has been in direct contact with Ambassador Celeste, our representative to India; and based on his report, we are confident that our State Department is acting swiftly and appropriately in this crisis.

Two days ago, our Nation's airlift, a 747 aircraft, loaded with supplies capa-

ble of assisting some 8,000 people, landed; and U.S. funds have already been contributed to India's prime minister's relief fund.

Secretary of State Colin Powell has been permanently engaged in ensuring that our government does all that it can to help in sending emergency equipment and personnel to help relieve this suffering and then assessing how and where our assets can best be utilized.

We commend India's defense minister, George Fernandes, for his swift and impressive response to this crisis. He is well known as being a man of the people and his dedicated work of his soldiers is doing God's work.

It was reported yesterday that Prime Minister/Vajpayee, while touring areas hardest hit by the powerful quake, pledged that no expense would be spared to rebuild the affected region as soon as possible. We in our Nation need to do all that we can to assist him in his efforts, and I look forward to hearing from the administration how we can be of further assistance.

I strongly support H. Con. Res. 15 and urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the founder of the India Caucus and the former chairman.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I come to the House floor this morning. Last Friday, as we know, one of the most destructive and devastating earthquakes hit India. And the area hit hardest by the quake was Gujarat, an area where a majority of Indian-Americans in my home district of New Jersey come from.

Many of these Indian-Americans today are still waiting to hear whether or not relatives and friends are still alive. I want the millions of Indian-Americans to know that my prayers remain with them as the struggle to find victims and provide assistance to the wounded continues.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution that we have before us today says two very important things: first, that, as a country and as a Congress, we express our deepest sympathies to all Indians for the tragic losses suffered as a result of last week's earthquake; and, second, the resolution voices this Congress' belief that we must substantially increase the amount of disaster assistance being provided by USAID and other relief agencies. This is critical.

As of today, USAID has already sent \$5 million in emergency supplies to the area most devastated. This is a good start, but we must do more. That is why I have asked President Bush to immediately double the amount of money being sent to India through USAID. I believe that we will need to do more in the future, but this assistance will make a huge difference in the lives of those who are now suffering.

I just lastly want to thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr.

McDERMOTT) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), the new chairman on the Congressional Caucus on India and Indian-Americans, for introducing this resolution in such a timely manner.

I ask that my colleagues support this resolution so that the nation of India and millions of Indian-Americans here in the United States know that they are not alone in helping the victims of this devastating event.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG).

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise this morning to join the bipartisan voices of support to the nation of India during this extremely difficult time.

As was noted last Friday, western India, Gujarat, was struck by a devastating earthquake resulting in the loss of tens of thousands of lives. It has been mentioned that 100,000 might be reached, death and devastation that defies description. Perhaps the injuries will be in the hundreds of thousands, economic damage of \$5 billion or more, and perhaps even that is not measurable.

With the destruction of thousands of buildings and the devastation of the region's infrastructure, India is in great need of support from the international community. And I am glad to hear that USAID has weighed in with an initial response on January 27th of \$5 million. There is more to come.

Along with that, the international community, the European Union, the International Red Cross is on board. Things are happening, but it cannot happen fast enough.

□ 1100

So, Mr. Speaker, I offer my condolences to all the families and individuals in India and the United States, and particularly those in my own district in Michigan who lost their loved ones, as well as those who have lost homes and possessions. I urge all Members to join in expressing our deepest sympathies and continued support as the people of India face the enormous task of rebuilding their country.

I urge my colleagues to support the resolution and I commend the authors, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT), as cochairs, for bringing this resolution forward.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK).

(Ms. KILPATRICK asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I first want to thank our ranking member for allowing me the time to come forward, and I thank also the two chairmen, as well as the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the

gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) for bringing this to the floor quickly.

As a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, where I serve on the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, this small appropriation that we are giving India today hopefully will be a first step in assisting them with the tragedy that they suffered on January 26.

I want to express my sympathy to the victims of the devastating earthquake and let them know that this Congress, USAID, the World Bank and the Asian Bank are working in partnership to make sure that we do what we can to help to rebuild that fabulous country.

It is important that we show our appreciation and support because millions of Indian-Americans, as has already been stated, here in this country have lost families in their homeland; over 20,000 and up to 100,000 people losing their lives.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to also express sympathy and offer support, and I hope that as we work through the foreign operations budget we will find more financing and more support for the people of India.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 15. I want to thank the chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), and I want to thank the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), for so expeditiously bringing this very important resolution before us. Obviously, I want to thank the Members of Congress who crafted it, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT).

This is so important, and I certainly express my sorrow and my sympathy to the citizens of Gujarat, and all of India, for the losses that they have experienced caused by the tragic earthquake in India which occurred on January 26.

This earthquake was the most powerful to strike India since August 15, 1950. The Indian Government estimates that as many as 100,000 people are dead, 200,000 are injured. The media has reported that more than 500,000 people are displaced. And although logistical constraints continue to hamper relief efforts, the United States Agency for International Development's Disaster Assistance Response Team, Catholic Charities, and dozens of relief agencies have worked with the Indian Government in identifying several critical needs in affected areas. Hundreds of volunteers have offered themselves and equipment to the relief efforts, including earth-moving equipment, concrete cutting and breaking supplies, medical equipment and supplies, mobile field surgical hospitals, portable water, sanitation facilities, food, and shelter.

Americans are traditionally very generous to those in need, be it an indi-

vidual or an entire Nation. And this terrible incident is another example of how we have to come together to attempt to lessen the severe pain that the country of India is currently experiencing.

Although the search for survivors decreases by the day, we must remember the rebuilding period that will take decades. Literally hundreds of thousands of men, women, and children are homeless, widowed, orphaned, and helpless.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent a large number of Indian-Americans in my district and to serve on the Congressional Caucus on India and Indian-Americans. I want to encourage all of my colleagues to join me in recognizing the pain of an entire Nation and the courage of its people while offering long-term support.

Paraphrasing John Donne, who said, "No man or woman is an island; we are all connected to each other. The death of any man or woman diminishes me. The bell tolls for each of us." Let us respond.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN), along with many Members of the Congressional Caucus on India and Indian-Americans.

Let me first of all acknowledge the great contributions that Indo-Americans have given to this Nation. Celebrating the 51st anniversary of their democracy this weekend in Houston with some 5,000, it was very much emphasized the drawing together of this community to lift up India and their loved ones.

We realize there may be as many as 100,000 dead. And as we have watched every morning on television, we have seen not only the sadness but we have seen the courage, we have seen the ability of those in India to survive. And they want to survive and they want to try to save their family members. I am hoping, and I believe this resolution is of great importance to acknowledge their courage, to acknowledge the devastation and to begin to talk as a country to increase the amount of aid.

Let me applaud the Congressional Caucus on India and Indian-Americans for its request for additional aid, and I wish to acknowledge Condoleezza Rice and the Bush administration in responding to a call I made for an increase in aid. Let us give the Indian people sympathy and love and let us give them support.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the sense of congress resolution expressing sympathy for the victims of the recent earthquake in India. The earthquake that struck India on January 26, 2001, was truly devastating and horrific. The loss of human life and mass destruction of property that has been witnessed

in India is sad and real. With at least 20,000 people killed, thousands missing or homeless, and the region's infrastructure totally devastated, the state of Gujarat and the Indian nation has an overwhelming task of rebuilding.

The earthquake had enormous affect in India's western Gujarat state, and governmental officials said thousands are injured or missing. The tremble caused high-rise buildings to shake from New Delhi to Mumbai and Kolkata. I have learned that the death toll could go as high as 100,000. Whatever the actual loss, such tragedies are difficult to ever justify morally or in any other logical fashion. It is a humanitarian disaster.

The United States can and should play a leading role in the international relief effort on behalf of India, given the growing ties with India and the burgeoning American-Indian Community in America. In fact, India and the United States have much in common as the world's two largest democracies. Last year, I had an opportunity to accompany President Clinton on his historic visit to India to further strengthen our ties with the people of India. The warmth and genuineness of the people of India was unforgettable.

This past weekend I attended a moving event with Indian-Americans from the 18th Congressional District of Texas. The Honorable Rinzing Wangdi, Consul General of India was in attendance. I had the opportunity to speak with a number of Indian-Americans who spoke about their shock and sadness regarding the earthquake.

Accordingly, I wrote and spoke with the Bush Administration officials, over the weekend, to ask for support of the Indian people. When meeting with American-Indians in my community, they urged me to seek assistance for the people of India. While I surely applaud the innovative efforts being taken within India to assist the victims during this traumatic time, urgent assistance is needed for the people of India. We have all learned by now that searchers in India used everything from sniffer dogs and sophisticated rock-cutting tools to screwdrivers and their bare hands to search for survivors. We must hope, of course, that any life that can be saved will be saved.

In bringing hope and expeditious relief to the people of India, we must listen to the growing Indian-American population for their guidance and expertise in emerging from this crisis. Indian-Americans, who have organized themselves into large numbers of associations and organizations, are playing an important role in strengthening cooperation in India and the United States. This is a promising sign for relations between our nations because we can pull together in times of need.

As a preliminary response, I am thankful that coordinated efforts by agencies such as the American Red Cross and international organizations are beginning to determine the needs of the survivors and those left without basic necessities. Contributions by individuals to such relief agencies will make such a discernable difference in the life of the people of India that have suffered so severely.

Additionally, India will be seeking loans from the international community to rebuild the devastated areas. The Government of India is expected to seek loans from international institutions, such as the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank. The World Bank has thus far offered \$300 million, and has pledged to put together a longer-term assistance plan in

consultation with the Gujarat state government. We understand that India may seek \$1.5 billion in multilateral loans.

Mr. Speaker, we must confront unilateral U.S. sanctions that are in place against India to bring some peace and stability to the affected areas. Under the unilateral sanctions regime on India that went into effect in 1998, the U.S. government was directed to oppose multilateral loans and credits to India. However, under legislation adopted by Congress, the President of the United States has the authority to waive certain sanctions, including the mandated U.S. opposition to World Bank loans, particularly those loans that would have a direct humanitarian benefit. Clearly, the present tragedy in India is an enormous humanitarian emergency.

Accordingly, I wish to join my colleagues and urge the Administration to fully support India's request for assistance through international financial institutions, and should work within the World Bank and other international organizations to expedite India's requests. It is the right thing to do and we all know it.

Mr. Speaker, at this time of enormous tragedy in India, it would send a positive signal of American concern and support if the remaining U.S. unilateral sanctions against India were waived to allow for friendlier and more normalized relations between our nations, and to remove any impediments for full and prompt delivery of assistance to India in this time of need. Let us be helpful and expeditious in this enormous time of need for the people of India.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the resolution.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

(Mr. PAUL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time. I too want to express my deep sympathy and sorrow for those people in India who are suffering. It was truly a devastating natural disaster and certainly the concern of all Americans goes out to all these people.

I do have some concerns about how we respond so often to disasters like this because we believe that we can solve all our problems by just going to the taxpayers. I know that this does not seem like the appropriate time to raise the question, but there was a time in our history when we did not assume that it was a constitutional approach to tax poor people in America to help people in other parts of the world. We have always resorted to charities and volunteer approaches, and I still believe that is proper. I do not think there is evidence to show that aid to governments is necessarily the most efficient manner of helping other people.

There is also the moral question. We talk about what we are giving today, and it is substantial amounts, and we are substantially increasing it. It could be \$10 million. It could be \$100 million. But nobody talks about could it cost something. Well, there is a cost to it and it might hurt some innocent people in this country; the people who we do

not know about. Somebody might not be able to build a house or get medical care. There may be somebody who will lose a job. There may be an increase in inflation. But we will never see those victims, so they are not represented. I think that if we were more determined to follow the rule of law and do this only in a voluntary manner we would not always place a burden on some innocent people in this country.

It was ironic that today, although there was talk earlier about sending some goods and surpluses, that actually the ambassador today sadly said he was not interested in any surpluses; he just wanted the dollars to come over there. And there may be a good reason for this, for efficiency sake or whatever. But in a way, I think if we have some surplus in food or something, we should be able to provide that.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to express my sympathy for victims of the recent earthquake in the State of Gujarat, India and, at the same time, my concern for American taxpayers who, once again, will see their constitution ignored and their pockets raided by their representatives in Washington—it is, of course, easy to express sympathy with other people's money.

Without so much as a hearing in the International Relations committee, this bill comes to the floor and, while laudably expressing deep sympathy for victims of this terrible natural disaster in India, regrettably expresses support for (a) the World Bank; (b) "substantially" increasing the amount of U.S. taxpayer-funded, disaster assistance; and (c) future economic assistance to rebuild the state of Gujarat, India.

Setting aside for the moment that nowhere in Article I, Sec. 8 (the enumerated powers clause) of the Federal Constitution can authority be found to take money from U.S. taxpayers for this purpose, additional problems result from passage of this resolution as well as those actions certain to follow as a consequence of the bill's passage.

First, the notion of taxing the fruits of financially struggling Americans with no constitutional authority only to send it to foreign governments is reprehensible. One of the problems with such aid is that it ultimately ends up in the hands of foreign bureaucrats who merely use it to advance their own foreign government agendas thus making it less likely to get to those most deserving. One need only compare the success of private charities in this country with those government relief efforts to clearly see government's profound and inherently inept record.

Secondly, forced "contributions" erode any satisfaction that comes from being a charitable individual. Without the personal choice of giving or not giving to charitable relief efforts, the decision to be charitable and the moral reward of so doing is completely eroded by the forced government.

Lastly, as a result of such actions as these, participation dwindles worldwide for the most efficient means of dealing with such catastrophes, that is, private disaster insurance. When disaster costs are socialized, greater catastrophic results are encouraged as more people ignore the costs of living in riskier areas. At the same time, these same actors ignore the cost savings and other benefits of

living in safer areas. Governments acting to socialize these costs actually stimulates the eventual death and destruction of more people and their property. (This, of course, is a lesson that the United States should learn to apply domestically, as well.)

While I truly do extend my heartfelt sympathy to those victims of the recent natural disaster in India, my duty remains to protect the U.S. taxpayer and uphold the constitutional limits of our Federal Government. For this reason and each of those detailed above, I must oppose this resolution.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS).

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I too rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 15.

A few weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, we heard of a devastating earthquake also in El Salvador. Here we go again, another earthquake that has profoundly affected the citizens of India.

As a former representative of the State of California, I had the privilege of working with the Indo-American community in the State of California to help establish a trade office there. I know that these individuals, both there and abroad, their families right now deserve our utmost support and sympathy, and particularly any humanitarian aids that we might provide.

I stand here before my colleagues, as a California representative, asking for full support and effort on behalf of our country for those mostly affected in the great country of India.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY).

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for bringing this quickly to the floor. Having just returned from India, I wish to express my deepest sympathy to the many victims of the recent earthquake. India is a beautiful country, with so many wonderful people. The scope of this disaster is just hard to imagine. Traveling across the country, I was amazed by the diversity in the culture and the hospitality of the hosts.

The devastation caused by this natural disaster has taken the lives of over 10,000 people but has impacted countless others, both in India and here in the United States. In my own district, the American-Indian community is very strong, and I am honored to consider many of them my friends.

It is difficult to imagine the magnitude of the devastation in India as we speak hear on the floor today, but I am deeply moved by the mobilization of the Indian community in response to this tragedy.

Let me borrow a quote from the inaugural address of President Bush. "Never tiring, never yielding, never finishing, we renew that purpose today; to make our country more just and generous; to affirm the dignity of our lives and every life. This work continues. This story goes on." That is America, there to help in time of need.

So I would encourage all Americans to consider contributing to one of the

many aid organizations that participate in the recovery and aid the mission in India. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, and I thank all who participated in bringing it to the floor today.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN).

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in support of House Concurrent Resolution 15 expressing sympathy for the victims of the devastating earthquake that struck India on January 26, 2001 and support for aid efforts.

Relative to our population size, the Virgin Islands proportionately has one of the largest Indian communities in the United States. In many communities of the Caribbean, people who trace their ancestry to India make up an important part of the fabric of those societies. So on behalf of the Virgin Islands' community I wanted to join my colleagues in expressing our sympathy and concern, but more importantly in encouraging our country's support.

One finds it difficult to imagine how a Nation will cope with a tragedy which estimates total deaths possibly as many as 100,000 people. They can only do so with our and the world's help.

I want to commend President Bush for his quick response in offering assistance to the people of India. Likewise, I want to commend the Speaker; our minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT); and my other colleagues for doing the same with this resolution today, and I urge its support.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

As chairman of the subcommittee on science that oversees what we do on earthquakes in the United States, I would like to sort of make two comments. Number one, we are going to do whatever we can in this country to relieve some of the suffering and some of the damage that has been caused by earthquakes in India, so certainly I support this resolution. But I would like to call to all my colleagues' attention, to the attention of the American people, that this is not isolated to some other country; something that might happen someplace else.

We have had serious earthquakes in the United States and will continue to have very serious earthquakes. The Loma Prieta earthquake was an estimated \$6 billion worth of property loss in addition to human life. And of course the Northridge in 1994 was an estimated \$40 billion loss of property as well as a great deal of damage to our physical health and well-being in California. It is a challenge.

We have passed a bill this past year which is probably the most aggressive effort in giving us a better time frame to determine what we can do in that short time period to reduce the damage to human and physical property.

□ 1115

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the vibrant Indo-American community in my district, many of whom who have relatives in Gujarat, I rise in strong support of the resolution and thank the distinguished co-chairman of our Caucus on India, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), who I was honored to travel with them and the President to India last year.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this resolution, which expresses sympathy for the loss of lives and Congress' commitment to help our ally, India, the world's largest democracy.

I know that USAID and other U.S. agencies are working hard to respond to this crisis. It is also important that we all work to get accurate information to our constituents so that they can know, in the earliest time possible, what has happened to their loved ones.

I certainly pledge to do my part and am happy once again to congratulate the authors of this resolution.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. OSE).

Mr. OSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the people of the Third Congressional District to express our deepest sympathies to the people of India for the losses suffered in the recent earthquake in Gujarat.

As we see the victim toll continue to rise, I pledge my support to those efforts in aiding India and its people to recover and rebuild their cities and their lives.

I hope that the Committee on Financial Services will take an extensive look at helping India through the Asian Development Bank. The U.S. contribution to the Asian Development Bank can provide an effective way to help India rebuild its cities and keep its society going.

I applaud the Bush administration's active role and those of all international organizations in supporting the people of India at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this resolution.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) a member of the committee.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, it is with such sadness that I rise today to speak of the enormous tragedy which has befallen the Indian people. The earthquake that struck Gujarat on January 26 has taken such a toll and the suffering continues.

I recently had the opportunity to travel to India and witnessed firsthand the grandeur of this great nation. I experienced the generosity and warmth of the Indian people and benefitted from their friendship.

The Indian people have overcome many challenges to become a great leader in technology and commerce. As the world's largest democracy, India is a great friend to the United States and an important ally. I trust we all are and will do all we can to help our friends in this, their time of need.

I commend the efforts in my district through a nonprofit agency, Direct Relief International, where shipments of medical supplies are on their way in a coordinated effort. I know that this aid we send cannot end their suffering, but we must reach out a helping hand and our prayers to our friends in India and to Indian Americans here at home.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) has 2½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN) has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FERGUSON).

(Mr. FERGUSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, on January 26 of this year, India suffered a tragic and deadly earthquake that stole the lives of thousands. It is with my deepest and heartfelt sympathies that I offer my prayers for all those affected by the earthquakes in western India.

I have spoken with Indian Americans in my district in New Jersey who are experiencing tremendous grief. My thoughts are with them and their family and friends and all of those who have been affected by this unbelievably tragic event.

Now that several days have passed and the critical threshold for time for the rescue of survivors is dwindling, I can only point to the recovery of a 7-year-old child, who was found in the arms of her deceased mother, as a sign of hope that there are still survivors. It is faith that has kept these survivors alive. We must not lose ours.

In the aftermath of these earthquakes, the people of India have shown an enormous display of strength, courage, and determination. We must support the thousands of survivors who have been left in shock and who are in desperate need of medical care, food and shelter.

We must ensure that the United States and international aid is delivered to provide both economic and disaster assistance in order to alleviate the suffering of the people of India in a timely fashion.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

(Mr. MENENDEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for the resolution before us, which expresses our deep sorrow and sympathy for the horrifying earthquake that devastated India, the world's largest democracy, on January 26.

In spite of this enormous natural disaster, the will of the Indian people perseveres as they try to recover and meet the latest challenge placed before them. Many of my constituents have family, friends and loved ones that live in Gujarat, the hardest-hit region, and my thoughts and prayers are with them.

Our shared democratic values and commitment to the rule of law and basic freedoms demonstrate why it is in America's interest to assist India, a growing trading partner, in its full recovery. While the Agency for International Development has already provided several millions of dollars in emergency humanitarian and disaster assistance, I hope President Bush will seek to do more.

Even though the earthquake will have a negative impact on India's growing economy, India should continue with its bold economic liberalization and revitalization efforts. Through those efforts, the United States will remain its largest foreign trading partner and investor.

The Indian-American community, which has played a strong and productive role in strengthening ties between India and the United States, has responded strongly in the midst of their overwhelming grief. The effects of this unfolding tragedy will be felt over time, but it remains necessary to continue with relief efforts and begin to consider the long-term steps necessary to help India rebuild itself.

I hope our Government will continue to support the relief efforts of AID, private voluntary organizations, and international financial institutions to supplement for the vigorous efforts of the Indian government as it helps its citizens recover and rebuild their lives. It gives us the sense of universality of our citizens, the citizens of the world. And in moments of need, this is the time which the United States has a tremendous opportunity to help.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from the State of Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), the original conceiver of this resolution before us today, who has been very gracious in cooperating both with the leadership and with the women members of our delegation to allow them to speak before him, as well.

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Illi-

nois (Speaker HASTERT), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the majority leader, and my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) for their sensitivity in expediting this important resolution to the floor.

I also take this opportunity to commend and thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), the co-chairs of the Caucus on India, for their leadership in drafting this important resolution.

I was also pleased to have a resolution which I submitted rolled in this one so that there would be one strong resolution and one strong display of unity.

I rise today on behalf of the people of the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois to offer support, sympathy and condolences to the people of India in light of what has been called one of the most deadliest and most devastating earthquakes ever to strike that country.

On Friday, January 26, India was struck by a devastating earthquake that measured 7.9 on the Richter scale. The earthquake has flattened the second most industrialized city in India. In addition, to causing massive destruction to the infrastructure of India—thousands of lives have been lost. As of today, the official death toll stands at more than 7 thousand. According to Indian Defense Minister George Fernandes, the death toll could go as high as 100 thousand, with twice as many injured. Moreover, more than 200,000 people are said to be homeless as a result of the devastating destruction to many of the buildings in Western India. Thousands of India citizens remain traumatized by the continuous strong tremors and aftershocks—some ranging up to 5.6 magnitude on the Richter scale, that continue to hit India.

Hundreds of thousands of persons are plagued with the prospect of no food, no running water for bathing or cooking, no blankets to stay warm and no working telephones to make contact with family.

But even in the midst of this tragedy, there are heartwarming stories that must be told. For example, the enormous outpouring of aid from the world community and especially Pakistan. Other stories include children and babies being pulled out of the rubble after being buried for 3–4 days. The remarkable story of the human heart and how it is able to triumph over tragedy. In Chicago, and other cities relief efforts are underway. There are the remarkable doctors, nurses and other medical personnel volunteering to work urgently against time to save as many victims as possible. Their dedication to save life regardless of the lack of medical supplies available to them, at times moving from victim to victim without time to sterilize their medical instruments. I praise the medical personnel who are doing everything possible to save their fellow citizens during this tragic time in their country.

It is estimated that the damages caused by the earthquake will be \$5.5 billion. India is in need of mobile surgery units, simple medications, bandages, splints, and electronic equipment to help search for bodies buried in the rubble. India has already begun to receive aid in forms of search dogs, cranes, generators, and experienced rescuers. The United States

has committed \$5 million in aid to be sent to India.

I call on all citizens of the United States to assist India in its rebuilding efforts. Crisis situations, like the one in India, calls for genuine unity among nations. It has been predicted that the rehabilitation and reconstruction may take another 10 to 20 years. The need for support to India will continue to exist after the rubble has been plowed away and the dead memorialized. This Resolution says that we, as a nation, will continue to be by India's side during its transformation back into a state of normalcy.

I want to commend the world community for its swift action and response and especially the country of Pakistan. I also want to commend all of the medical personnel, the doctors and nurses, and others who have given so much of themselves so that they could be of help.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my new intern, Jennifer Luciano from Loyola University. This was her first work effort, and I think she did an outstanding job.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the State of Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

(Mr. INSLEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, the depth of the suffering and tragedy in India I think is obvious. But I think what is not, perhaps, obvious is to the extent of how close our relationship will be with the Indian people over the next several decades.

I would suggest that one of, and just one of the reasons we should significantly increase our aid to India at this time is that we are going to have a relationship with India, the world's largest democracy, I believe, in the next several decades every bit as close and important, as vital and productive as our previous relationship with the continent of Europe in the last several centuries. And because of that, we ought to significantly increase, is my belief, our commitment, which, at this moment, stands at, I believe, \$5 million.

My growing friendship with the Indo-American community, seeing the creative talent that has come to our community in my district, which is the major reason for the economic explosion in my district with their creative talents, leads me to conclude that India is going to be every bit as important as the European community.

I want to compliment the Bush administration in trying to assess the damage in India. I have spoken to two assistant secretaries in the last 2 days about that. But I do want to encourage the executive authority to significantly increase the aid on an emergency basis, even before we can do an emergency supplemental. And the reason I say that is, the executive staff does have the ability to do this at this time. There are funds in the various accounts to be able to do so. And it is my

belief that this would be a tremendous step for the new administration to take, to come up with an aid package in multiples of \$5 million.

It would demonstrate the compassion that is the basic character of the country, but it would also demonstrate that this new administration intends to have a proactive beneficial international policy.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from the State of New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

(Mr. HOLT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, while thousands of individuals celebrated their domestic accomplishments and democratic government a week ago on Republic Day, the earthquake shook the ground that they marched on and turned a festivity into a disaster for hundreds of thousands.

Earlier this month, I had the privilege of traveling again in India, a country rich in heritage, beauty and traditions, a country quickly rising in economic power.

Now, however, despite the dismal reports, small glimmers of hope are emerging from the darkness. Just yesterday, a 24-year-old computer student, Veeral Dalal, a resident of my State of New Jersey, was rescued in Bhuj after spending 4 days with only 8 inches of room between him and a collapsed ceiling.

Americans are generous to those in need. We stand ready to offer assistance. Mr. Dalal is just one example of how grief can be mitigated with hope. But we must stand ready not only to offer help and rescue, recovery, and emergency shelter and care, but also in the longer-term efforts in community planning and reconstruction of a modern infrastructure in keeping with the great country of India and our growing closeness to democratic countries.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN) has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

(Mr. CROWLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 15 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), the gentlemen from Illinois, Mr. HYDE and Mr. DAVIS, and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) and my good friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN).

I wish to express my deepest sympathy to the victims of the devastating earthquake that occurred on the morning of January 26 of this year in the Indian state of Gujarat in western India and the families of the victims both in India and the United States.

As a member of the Caucus on India and as a representative of a sizable population from Gujarat and other parts of India in my home district, I will do everything I can to help my constituents reach out to their families and friends who suffered tremendous losses as a result of this terrible event.

□ 1130

I will be meeting with leaders of the Indian community in my district this Thursday to talk about the relief efforts that are under way thus far.

I wish to commend the gentlemen from California, Illinois, New York, and Washington for their leadership in rapidly responding to the Gujarat earthquake over the last several days. I also want to extend my thanks to the Bush administration, Secretary Powell, and USAID for their quick response to the situation in India and the release of emergency funding.

As my colleagues have done, I urge the Bush administration to increase the amount of technical and monetary support both for immediate disaster relief as well as for long-term reconstruction of the Gujarat state economy. I also urge the Bush administration to support World Bank funding for earthquake relief.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to conclude by thanking the distinguished new chairman of the House Committee on International Relations on what appears to be his first successful handling of a bill in that committee on the floor. He shows a lot of promise.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened by the news of the earthquake in India's Gujarat state and would like to offer my sincerest condolences to the families of India. In this time of tragedy, the people of India can be assured that we will stand by them and continue to offer our support. We will do all we can to aid those who are suffering and those who must begin the difficult process of rebuilding.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I stand before the House today with a heavy heart to express my profound sorrow and sympathy for the victims of the Gujarat earthquake in India.

This terrible act of nature destroyed thousands of homes and businesses, crippled roads and bridges, and unleashed raging fires. But, my colleagues, the most devastating toll of destruction resulting from last Friday's earthquake is not on the physical structures in India, but on the citizens of India themselves. Tens of thousands of Indian people were killed as a result of this earthquake, and a myriad of others were critically injured.

Mr. Speaker, I know from my personal involvement with the Indian-American community in my congressional district and from my service on the Caucus on India and Indian-Americans that the people of India and the United States have long enjoyed a hearty and prosperous friendship. I am also very aware of the strong sense of community and social responsibility that Indian-Americans possess. When a tragedy of this magnitude occurs, the Indian people both domestic and abroad, rally

this spirit of community and fellowship to help the plight of those suffering from harm.

We too must answer this call to service and community, and reaffirm our support for the people of India in this time of dire need. That is why I became an original cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 15, which officially recognizes and encourages efforts to alleviate the suffering of the people of India. I fully support continuing and increasing the amount of disaster assistance provided to India by the United States Agency for International Development, and encourage other financial institutions such as the World Bank to provide economic assistance.

While no amount of money could ever hope to replace the loss of life, we can endeavor to ease the suffering and help the reconstruction efforts of those survivors left to pick up the pieces. I am pleased that H. Con. Res. 15 passed the House overwhelmingly earlier this afternoon. Once again, Mr. Speaker, let me express my condolences to the victims of the Indian earthquake.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to come before the House today and pledge support to H. Con. Res. 15, a concurrent resolution expressing sympathy for those suffering due to the devastating earthquake in India. As a member of the India Caucus I want to commend Representatives McDERMOTT and ROYCE who introduced this resolution and so quickly brought it to the House floor.

On January 26, an earthquake measuring 7.9 on the Richter Scale occurred in western India. The epicenter of the earthquake was located 12 miles northeast of Bhuj in Gujarat State, India. Since January 26, there have been 77 confirmed aftershocks, 19 of which registered above 5.0 on the Richter Scale. On January 28, two aftershocks caused additional structural damage. Pakistan, Nepal, and Bangladesh were also impacted. The earthquake was the most powerful to strike India since August 15, 1950, when an 8.5-magnitude earthquake killed 1,538 people in northeastern Assam state.

This enormous tragedy has left tens of thousands of people dead, hundreds of thousands homeless, and the region's infrastructure devastated. The state of Gujarat and the entire nation of India face an enormous task of rebuilding. Friday's quake flattened two cities in India's western Gujarat state, and government officials said thousands are injured or still missing.

In addition to the relief assistance already being provided by the Government of India, I am here today to support United States efforts as well. On January 27, the United States Agency for International Development/Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance (USAID/OFDA) announced that it is prepared to provide \$5 million in emergency humanitarian assistance. Mr. Speaker, the United States has a long history of support for other nations in their time of need. And I join other Members of the Congress in supporting these efforts for India.

I am pleased to be working with members of the Indian community in my congressional district to expedite assistance to those in need.

My prayers are with those affected by the earthquake and those in my district and other Americans who have family and friends in India.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 15,

which expresses Congress' sympathy to the citizens of Gujarat, India, for the devastating losses suffered as a result of last week's deadly earthquake. This resolution urges economic and disaster assistance to help the victims of this disaster rebuild their lives. As an original cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 15, and a longtime friend of India, I urge all my colleagues to join me in voting for this measure.

This tragedy has cost the lives of tens of thousand in India, injured more than 100,000, and displaced more than a half million men, women, and children. Fires still burn throughout the devastated region. The damage to the region is expected to exceed \$5.5 billion. In the face of such a catastrophe, it is imperative that the global community actively respond. Already, nations around the globe, and countless non-governmental organizations, have offered assistance to India. We in the United States can do no less. I commend President Bush for quickly offering assistance to India, and urge my colleagues to do still more.

I offer my condolences to the people of India, and especially the victims of the Gujarat earthquake and their families. I thank my colleagues, Mr. McDERMOTT and Mr. ROYCE, for offering this resolution, and urge all my colleagues to support it.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 15 which expresses the sympathy and support of the American people and the U.S. Congress to the victims of the devastating earthquake in western India. On Friday, January 26, the Indian State of Gujarat was struck by a massive quake which was felt across the subcontinent from Pakistan to Nepal and Bangladesh. For Gujarat, the calamity was overwhelming—thousands have lost their lives and countless others have been rendered homeless and destitute.

The Government of India has been coping heroically in the face of such widespread destruction. The Indian Armed Forces have been the backbone of this response, joined by thousands of ordinary people who have put aside their own personal loss to help save lives and provide assistance to others.

The aftershocks of the quake can be felt around the world and in our own country as thousands of Indian-Americans face the loss of loved ones.

I want to commend the Bush administration and the U.S. Agency for International Development for immediately responding to the emergency by providing \$5 million in humanitarian assistance and dispatching a plane load of supplies and relief experts to the region.

I also want to commend the American people, particularly the Indian-American community for their tremendous outpouring of concern and offers of assistance to the victims of the disaster. As we have seen time and again, during the recent earthquake in El Salvador and other foreign disasters, the generosity and caring of the American people knows no boundaries.

The world community has also recognized the enormity of this disaster and aid has been flooding in from all corners. But I am afraid that even this generous response will be inadequate in the face of such overwhelming destruction.

This resolution pledges the support of the U.S. Congress to provide additional assistance to the Indian Government and the people of

Gujarat as they try to rebuild their lives and their country.

In light of the very special relationship between the United States and India, I think it is important that we send this message of solidarity and hope to the people of India.

There will be dark days ahead for the people of India as they dig out from beneath the rubble, cremate the dead and try to piece together their lives and livelihoods. But they can take comfort from the fact that they are not alone in facing this challenge. America and the world will stand by India in its hour of need.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in support of this resolution expressing sympathy for the victims of the January 26, 2001, earthquake in India. The earthquake and the subsequent aftershocks have killed tens of thousands of people.

On the heels of a large earthquake and mudslides in El Salvador, the earthquake in India has again challenged the international community to respond to people in need. And again we have responded with overwhelming support. Countries from the United States to Great Britain to Israel to countries around the world responded with humanitarian aid.

Most heartening is the aid provided by Pakistan. Despite the ongoing conflict over the disputed territory along the Indian-Pakistani border, Pakistan has reached out to its neighbor to help in a time of need, just as India has during natural disasters that have devastated Pakistan. It is my hope that through this tragedy these two enemies can put aside their differences to create a lasting peace.

I applaud the pledge of support by USAID, and hope that this Congress will provide further resources to help the people of India recover from this disaster. This resolution also commits the Congress to providing additional funding to disaster assistance. It is my hope that when it comes time to appropriate this money, this body will consider disaster assistance a higher priority than a tax cut or an aircraft carrier or a national missile defense system. Wherever and whenever there are people suffering around the world the United States should respond to those people in need through support of international efforts. We should make it the cornerstone of our foreign policy to help those who suffer from not only natural disasters, but also those who suffer under inhumane sanctions, disease, and war.

On behalf of the many Indian-Americans and constituents in my district, I join with my colleagues in expressing our deepest sympathies with the people who have lost family members, homes, and businesses in this disaster. I am confident that with the outpouring of international aid and support coupled with the enduring resilience of the Indian people, that they will be able to rebuild and continue to move forward. Also, we thank all those individuals, organizations, and countries who respond to disasters throughout the world.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, as the devastating results of the earthquake in Gujarat, India continue to unfold before the world's eyes, I believe I speak for all citizens of the United States when I say sorrow fills every heart and soul.

When tragedy of this magnitude strikes, its impact is not isolated by physical boundaries. The pain is felt by the entire world. Let us, as

individuals, remember that while we have all experienced loss in our own lives at one time or another, many Indian families lost everything they had in one devastating moment. Therefore, let us, as members of local communities, reach out to our Indian friends, neighbors and coworkers and do all that we can to ease their pain and suffering. Let us, as a country, use the resources we've been blessed with to help the Indian government cope with this widespread destruction and loss of life.

Personally, I send my deepest sympathy to those families affected by this cataclysmic disaster. I, along with my family and my staff, also extend our hearts and hands to the Indian community here in America. With humbled hearts, we will pray for strength for the Indian nation.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member rises today in support of H. Con. Res. 15, which expresses sympathy for the victims of the devastating earthquake that struck India on January 26, 2001, and provides support for ongoing aid efforts.

This Member would like to thank the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) for introducing this sense of the Congress resolution and for his efforts in bringing this measure to the House floor today.

As is well known, on the morning of January 26, 2001, a deadly earthquake shook the state of Gujarat in western India, which injured and killed untold thousands of people and has left the building infrastructure in ruin.

India has appealed to the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, and the international community for the economic assistance to meet the relief needs facing India. It is important to note that the Asian Development Bank promotes development in the Asia-Pacific region through project investment lending, policy reform lending and advice, and technical assistance.

As the chairman of the Financial Services Subcommittee on International Monetary Policy and Trade, which has jurisdiction over the World Bank and the regional development banks such as the Asian Development Bank, this Member wants to convey his strong support for these aid efforts for India.

This sense of the Congress resolution was referred to both the House Financial Services and House International Relations Committee. As a member of both of these committees, this Member would like to encourage his colleagues to vote in support of H. Con. Res. 15.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution recognizing the recent tragedy in India as a result of a devastating earthquake and the horrific loss of life experienced by the Indian nation.

I want to commend the gentleman from Washington for introducing the original resolution.

Mr. Speaker, at the same time we are expressing our sympathy and support for the people of India, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues another tragic earthquake which recently hit El Salvador with equally horrific devastation and loss of life.

On January 13 an earthquake with a magnitude of 7.6, only 3 tenths of a point less powerful than the earthquake in India, rocked El Salvador. It is estimated that close to 1,000 people lost their lives, with another 4,000 injured.

Recently, I visited El Salvador along with several of my colleagues and witnessed first

hand the tragedy which has engulfed that nation. We were told that over 75,000 houses were destroyed and another 118,000 damaged ultimately affecting well over 1 million Salvadorans.

Mr. Speaker, just when the people of El Salvador seemed to have recovered from the devastating effects of Hurricane Mitch, this tragedy hits forcing new sacrifices from an already battered population.

But as they did after Mitch, the people of El Salvador have already begun to put their lives back together with a fierce spirit of self-determination, and a lot of help from friends far and wide.

And although we are dealing here with the tragedy in India, I want to recognize the valiant efforts of the people of El Salvador, the hard work of their President, Flores and other government officials for their tireless efforts. I especially want to commend the dedicated people at the Agency for International Development and their Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance for their rapid reaction to this disaster and for the aid they provided on a moments notice and continue to provide today as Salvador recovers.

Mr. Speaker, we all recognize the horror of these kinds of tragedies and the toll they take on the people of the nation affected. I want to salute those brave men and women in both India and El Salvador for the sacrifices they have made in these times of tragedy.

I urge support of this resolution and for the people of India and El Salvador.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 15.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on motions to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today and on the approval of the Journal.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

House Concurrent Resolution 14, by the yeas and nays;

House Concurrent Resolution 15, by the yeas and nays;

approval of the Journal, de novo.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

PERMITTING USE OF ROTUNDA OF CAPITOL FOR CEREMONY AS PART OF COMMEMORATION OF DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE OF VICTIMS OF HOLOCAUST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 14.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 14, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 407, nays 0, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 6]

YEAS—407

Ackerman	Costello	Graves
Aderholt	Coyne	Green (TX)
Akin	Cramer	Green (WI)
Allen	Crane	Greenwood
Andrews	Crenshaw	Grucci
Armey	Crowley	Gutierrez
Baca	Cubin	Gutknecht
Baird	Culberson	Hall (OH)
Baker	Cummings	Hall (TX)
Baldacci	Cunningham	Hansen
Baldwin	Davis (CA)	Harman
Ballenger	Davis (FL)	Hart
Barcia	Davis (IL)	Hastings (FL)
Barr	Davis, Jo Ann	Hastings (WA)
Barrett	Davis, Thomas	Hayes
Bartlett	M.	Hayworth
Barton	Deal	Hefley
Bass	DeGette	Herger
Bentsen	Delahunt	Hill
Bereuter	DeLauro	Hilleary
Berkley	DeLay	Hilliard
Berry	DeMint	Hinchee
Biggert	Deutsch	Hobson
Bilirakis	Diaz-Balart	Hoeffel
Bishop	Dicks	Hoekstra
Blagojevich	Dingell	Holden
Blumenauer	Doggett	Holt
Blunt	Dooley	Honda
Boehlert	Doolittle	Hooley
Boehner	Doyle	Horn
Bonilla	Dreier	Hostettler
Bonior	Duncan	Houghton
Borski	Dunn	Hoyer
Boswell	Edwards	Hulshof
Boucher	Ehlers	Hunter
Boyd	Ehrlich	Hutchinson
Brady (PA)	Emerson	Hyde
Brady (TX)	Engel	Inslee
Brown (FL)	English	Isakson
Brown (OH)	Eshoo	Israel
Brown (SC)	Etheridge	Issa
Bryant	Evans	Istook
Burr	Farr	Jackson (IL)
Burton	Fattah	Jackson-Lee
Buyer	Ferguson	(TX)
Calvert	Filner	Jefferson
Camp	Flake	Jenkins
Cannon	Fletcher	John
Cantor	Foley	Johnson (CT)
Capito	Ford	Johnson (IL)
Capps	Fossella	Johnson, E. B.
Capuano	Frank	Johnson, Sam
Cardin	Frelinghuysen	Jones (NC)
Carson (OK)	Frost	Jones (OH)
Castle	Gallegly	Kanjorski
Chabot	Gekas	Kaptur
Chambliss	Gibbons	Keller
Clay	Gilchrest	Kelly
Clayton	Gillmor	Kennedy (MN)
Clement	Gilman	Kerns
Clyburn	Gonzalez	Kildee
Coble	Goode	Kilpatrick
Collins	Goodlatte	Kind (WI)
Combest	Gordon	King (NY)
Condit	Goss	Kingston
Conyers	Graham	Kirk
Cooksey	Granger	Klecza

Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Largent
Larsen (WA)
Larsen (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Mink
Moakley
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey

Oliver
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows

Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

EXPRESSING SYMPATHY FOR VICTIMS OF EARTHQUAKE IN INDIA ON JANUARY 26, 2001, AND SUPPORT FOR ONGOING AID EFFORTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 15.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 15, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 406, nays 1, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 7]

YEAS—406

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Arney
Baca
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett
Barton
Bass
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehkert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Thomas M.
Deal
DeGette
DeLaunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Ford
Fossella
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss

Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilliard
Hincheey
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kerns
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)

Kingston
Kirk
Klecza
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Largent
Larsen (WA)
Larsen (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Mink
Moakley
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar

Obey
Oliver
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows

NAYS—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—26

Abercrombie
Bachus
Becerra
Berman
Bono
Callahan
Carson (IN)
Cox
DeFazio
Everett
Ganske
Gephardt
Hinojosa
Kennedy (RI)
Lantos
Leach
Lewis (GA)
Meek (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Ortiz
Oxley
Rush
Thurman
Vitter
Wexler

NOT VOTING—26

Abercrombie
Bachus
Becerra
Berman
Bono
Callahan
Carson (IN)
Cox
DeFazio
Everett
Ganske
Gephardt
Hinojosa
Kennedy (RI)
Lantos
Leach
Lewis (GA)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Ortiz
Oxley
Rush
Thurman
Vitter
Wexler

□ 1155

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1205

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 382, noes 19, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 8]

AYES—382

Ackerman	Davis (CA)	Hill
Aderholt	Davis (FL)	Hilliard
Akin	Davis (IL)	Hinchey
Allen	Davis, Jo Ann	Hobson
Andrews	Davis, Thomas	Hoefel
Armey	M.	Hoekstra
Baca	Deal	Holden
Baker	DeGette	Holt
Baldacci	Delahunt	Honda
Baldwin	DeLauro	Hooley
Ballenger	DeMint	Horn
Barcia	Deutsch	Hostettler
Barr	Diaz-Balart	Houghton
Barrett	Dicks	Hoyer
Bartlett	Dingell	Hulshof
Barton	Doggett	Hunter
Bass	Dooley	Hutchinson
Bentsen	Doolittle	Hyde
Bereuter	Doyle	Inslee
Berkley	Dreier	Isakson
Berry	Duncan	Israel
Biggert	Dunn	Issa
Bilirakis	Edwards	Istook
Bishop	Ehlers	Jackson (IL)
Blagojevich	Ehrlich	Jackson-Lee
Blumenauer	Emerson	(TX)
Blunt	Engel	Jefferson
Boehlert	English	Jenkins
Bonilla	Eshoo	John
Bonior	Etheridge	Johnson (CT)
Borski	Evans	Johnson (IL)
Boswell	Farr	Johnson, E. B.
Boucher	Fattah	Johnson, Sam
Boyd	Ferguson	Jones (OH)
Brady (PA)	Flake	Kanjorski
Brady (TX)	Fletcher	Kaptur
Brown (FL)	Foley	Keller
Brown (OH)	Ford	Kelly
Brown (SC)	Fossella	Kennedy (MN)
Bryant	Frank	Kennedy (RI)
Burr	Frelinghuysen	Kerns
Burton	Frost	Kildee
Calvert	Gallely	Kilpatrick
Camp	Gekas	Kind (WI)
Cannon	Gibbons	King (NY)
Cantor	Gilchrest	Kingston
Capito	Gillmor	Kleczka
Capps	Gilman	Knollenberg
Cardin	Gonzalez	Kolbe
Carson (OK)	Goode	LaFalce
Castle	Goodlatte	LaHood
Chabot	Gordon	Lampson
Chambliss	Goss	Langevin
Clay	Graham	Largent
Clayton	Granger	Larsen (WA)
Clement	Graves	Larsen (CT)
Clyburn	Green (TX)	Latham
Coble	Green (WI)	LaTourette
Collins	Greenwood	Lee
Combest	Grucci	Levin
Condit	Gutknecht	Lewis (CA)
Conyers	Hall (OH)	Lewis (KY)
Cooksey	Hall (TX)	Linder
Cox	Hansen	Lipinski
Coyne	Harman	LoBiondo
Cramer	Hart	Lofgren
Crenshaw	Hastings (FL)	Lowey
Crowley	Hastings (WA)	Lucas (KY)
Cubin	Hayes	Lucas (OK)
Culberson	Hayworth	Luther
Cummings	Hefley	Maloney (CT)
Cunningham	Herger	Maloney (NY)

Manzullo	Platts	Smith (TX)
Markey	Pombo	Smith (WA)
Mascara	Pomeroy	Snyder
Matheson	Portman	Solis
Matsui	Price (NC)	Souder
McCarthy (MO)	Pryce (OH)	Spence
McCarthy (NY)	Putnam	Spratt
McCollum	Quinn	Stearns
McCrery	Radanovich	Stenholm
McGovern	Rahall	Strickland
McHugh	Rangel	Stump
McInnis	Regula	Sununu
McIntyre	Rehberg	Sweeney
McKeon	Reyes	Tancredo
McKinney	Reynolds	Tanner
McNulty	Riley	Tauscher
Meehan	Rivers	Tauzin
Meek (FL)	Rodriguez	Taylor (NC)
Meeks (NY)	Roemer	Terry
Menendez	Rogers (KY)	Thomas
Mica	Rogers (MI)	Thornberry
Millender-	Rohrabacher	Thune
McDonald	Ros-Lehtinen	Thurman
Miller (FL)	Ross	Tiahrt
Miller, George	Rothman	Tiberi
Mink	Roukema	Tierney
Moakley	Roybal-Allard	Toomey
Moran (KS)	Royce	Towns
Morella	Ryan (WI)	Trafigant
Murtha	Ryun (KS)	Turner
Myrick	Sanchez	Udall (CO)
Nadler	Sandlin	Udall (NM)
Napolitano	Sawyer	Upton
Neal	Scarborough	Velazquez
Nethercutt	Schakowsky	Visclosky
Ney	Schiff	Walden
Northup	Schrock	Walsh
Norwood	Scott	Wamp
Nussle	Sensenbrenner	Watkins
Obey	Serrano	Watt (NC)
Oliver	Sessions	Watts (OK)
Osborne	Shadegg	Waxman
Ose	Shaw	Weiner
Otter	Shays	Weldon (FL)
Owens	Sherman	Weldon (PA)
Pallone	Sherwood	Wexler
Pascarella	Shimkus	Whitfield
Pastor	Shows	Wicker
Paul	Shuster	Wilson
Payne	Simmons	Wolf
Pence	Simpson	Woolsey
Peterson (MN)	Sisisky	Wu
Peterson (PA)	Skeen	Wynn
Petri	Skelton	Young (AK)
Phelps	Slaughter	Young (FL)
Pickering	Smith (MI)	
Pitts	Smith (NJ)	

NOES—19

Baird	Moore	Taylor (MS)
Costello	Oberstar	Thompson (CA)
Crane	Ramstad	Thompson (MS)
Finler	Sabo	Waters
Gutierrez	Schaffer	Weller
Kucinich	Stark	
McDermott	Stupak	

NOT VOTING—32

Abercrombie	DeLay	Miller, Gary
Bachus	Everett	Mollohan
Becerra	Ganske	Moran (VA)
Berman	Gephardt	Ortiz
Boehner	Hilleary	Oxley
Bono	Hinojosa	Pelosi
Buyer	Jones (NC)	Rush
Callahan	Kirk	Sanders
Capuano	Lantos	Saxton
Carson (IN)	Leach	Vitter
DeFazio	Lewis (GA)	

□ 1215

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, I was unavoidably absent when three rollcall votes were taken. Had I been present, I would have voted:

Rollcall No. 6, H. Con. Res. 14, Permission for use of the Capitol Rotunda for a Ceremony as a part of the remembrance of victims of the Holocaust, "yes"; Rollcall No. 7, H. Con. Res.

15, Expressing sympathy for the victims of the earthquake in India on January 26, 2001, "yes"; and Rollcall No. 8, Approval of the Journal, "yes."

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 24) and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 24

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

House Administration: Mr. Ehlers; Mr. Mica; Mr. Linder; Mr. Doolittle and Mr. Reynolds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 25) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 25

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing Committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Agriculture: Mr. Stenholm of Texas, Mr. Condit of California, Mr. Peterson of Minnesota, Mr. Dooley of California, Mrs. Clayton of North Carolina, Mr. Hilliard of Alabama, Mr. Holden of Pennsylvania, Mr. Bishop of Georgia, Mr. Thompson of Mississippi, Mr. Baldacci of Maine, Mr. Berry of Arkansas, Mr. McIntyre of North Carolina, Mr. Etheridge of North Carolina, Mr. John of Louisiana, Mr. Boswell of Iowa, Mr. Phelps of Illinois, Mr. Thompson of California, Mr. Hill of Indiana, and Mr. Baca of California;

Committee on Appropriations: Mr. Obey of Wisconsin, Mr. Murtha of Pennsylvania, Mr. Dicks of Washington, Mr. Sabo of Minnesota, Mr. Hoyer of Maryland, Mr. Mollohan of West Virginia, Ms. Kaptur of Ohio, Ms. Pelosi of California, Mr. Visclosky of Indiana, Mrs. Lowey of New York, Mr. Serrano of New York, Ms. DeLauro of Connecticut, Mr. Moran of Virginia, Mr. Oliver of Massachusetts, Mr. Pastor of Arizona, Mrs. Meek of Florida, Mr. Price of North Carolina, Mr. Edwards of Texas, Mr. Cramer of Alabama, Mr. Kennedy of Rhode Island, Mr. Clyburn of South Carolina, Mr. Hinchey of New York, Ms. Roybal-Allard of California, Mr. Farr of California, Mr. Jackson of Illinois, Ms. Kilpatrick of Michigan, and Mr. Boyd of Florida;

Committee on Armed Services: Mr. Skelton of Missouri, Mr. Sisisky of Virginia, Mr. Spratt of South Carolina, Mr. Ortiz of Texas, Mr. Evans of Illinois, Mr. Taylor of Mississippi, Mr. Abercrombie of Hawaii, Mr.

Meehan of Massachusetts, Mr. Underwood of Guam, Mr. Blagojevich of Illinois, Mr. Reyes of Texas, Mr. Allen of Maine, Mr. Snyder of Arkansas, Mr. Turner of Texas, Mr. Smith of Washington, Ms. Sanchez of California, Mr. Maloney of Connecticut, Mr. McIntyre of North Carolina, Mr. Rodriguez of Texas, Ms. McKinney of Georgia, Ms. Tauscher of California, Mr. Brady of Pennsylvania, Mr. Andrews of New Jersey, Mr. Hill of Indiana, Mr. Thompson of California, Mr. Larson of Connecticut, Ms. Davis of California, and Mr. Langevin of Rhode Island;

Committee on the Budget: Mr. Spratt of South Carolina, Mr. McDermott of Washington, Mr. Thompson of Mississippi, Mr. Bentsen of Texas, Mr. Davis of Florida, Mrs. Clayton of North Carolina, Mr. Price of North Carolina, Mr. Markey of Massachusetts, Mr. Kleczka of Wisconsin, Mr. Clement of Tennessee, Mr. Moran of Virginia, Ms. Hooley of Oregon, Mr. Holt of New Jersey, Mr. Hoeffel of Pennsylvania, and Ms. Baldwin of Wisconsin;

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Mr. Dingell of Michigan, Mr. Waxman of California, Mr. Markey of Massachusetts, Mr. Hall of Texas, Mr. Boucher of Virginia, Mr. Towns of New York, Mr. Pallone of New Jersey, Mr. Brown of Ohio, Mr. Gordon of Tennessee, Mr. Deutsch of Florida, Mr. Rush of Illinois, Ms. Eshoo of California, Mr. Stupak of Michigan, Mr. Engel of New York, Mr. Sawyer of Ohio, Mr. Wynn of Maryland, Mr. Green of Texas, Ms. McCarthy of Missouri, Mr. Strickland of Ohio, Ms. DeGette of Colorado, Mr. Barrett of Wisconsin, Mr. Luther of Minnesota, and Ms. Capps of California;

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Mr. Miller of California, Mr. Kildee of Michigan, Mr. Owens of New York, Mr. Payne of New Jersey, Ms. Mink of Hawaii, Mr. Andrews of New Jersey, Mr. Roemer of Indiana, Mr. Scott of Virginia, Ms. Woolsey of California, Ms. Rivers of Michigan, Mr. Fattah of Pennsylvania, Mr. Hinojosa, Ms. McCarthy of New York, Mr. Tierney of Massachusetts, Mr. Kind of Wisconsin, Ms. Sanchez of California, Mr. Ford of Tennessee, Mr. Kucinich of Ohio, Mr. Wu of Oregon, Mr. Holt of New Jersey, Ms. McCollum of Minnesota, and Ms. Solis of California.

Committee on Financial Services: Mr. LaFalce of New York, Mr. Frank of Massachusetts, Mr. Kanjorski of Pennsylvania, Ms. Waters of California, Ms. Maloney of New York, Mr. Guterrez of Illinois, Ms. Velazquez of New York, Mr. Watt of North Carolina, Mr. Ackerman of New York, Mr. Bentsen of Texas, Mr. Maloney of Connecticut, Ms. Hooley of Oregon, Mrs. Carson of Indiana, Mr. Sherman of California, Mr. Sandlin of Texas, Mr. Meeks of New York, Ms. Lee of California, Mr. Mascara of Pennsylvania, Mr. Inslee of Washington, Ms. Schakowsky of Illinois, Mr. Moore of Kansas, Mr. Gonzalez of Texas, Ms. Tubbs Jones of Ohio, and Mr. Capuano of Massachusetts;

Committee on Government Reform: Mr. Waxman of California, Mr. Lantos of California, Mr. Owens of New York, Mr. Towns of New York, Mr. Kanjorski of Pennsylvania, Ms. Mink of Hawaii, Ms. Maloney of New York, Ms. Norton of the District of Columbia, Mr. Fattah of Pennsylvania, Mr. Cummings of Maryland, Mr. Kucinich of Ohio, Mr. Blagojevich of Illinois, Mr. Davis of Illinois, Mr. Tierney of Massachusetts, Mr. Turner of Texas, Mr. Allen of Maine, Mr. Ford of Tennessee, and Ms. Schakowsky of Illinois;

Committee on House Administration: Mr. Fattah of Pennsylvania, and Mr. Davis of Florida;

Committee on International Relations: Mr. Lantos of California, Mr. Berman of California, Mr. Ackerman of New York, Mr. Paleomavaega of American Samoa, Mr.

Payne of New Jersey, Mr. Menendez of New Jersey, Mr. Brown of Ohio, Ms. McKinney of Georgia, Mr. Hastings of Florida, Mr. Hilliard of Alabama, Mr. Sherman of California, Mr. Wexler of Florida, Mr. Rothman of New Jersey, Mr. Davis of Florida, Mr. Delahunt of Massachusetts, Mr. Meeks of New York, Ms. Lee of California, Mr. Crowley of New York and Mr. Hoeffel of Pennsylvania.

Committee on the Judiciary: Mr. Conyers of Michigan, Mr. Frank of Massachusetts, Mr. Berman of California, Mr. Boucher of Virginia, Mr. Nadler of New York, Mr. Scott of Virginia, Mr. Watt of North Carolina, Ms. Lofgren of California, Ms. Jackson-Lee of Texas, Ms. Waters of California, Mr. Meehan of Massachusetts, Mr. Delahunt of Massachusetts, Mr. Wexler of Florida, Mr. Rothman of New Jersey, Ms. Baldwin of Wisconsin, and Mr. Weiner of New York;

Committee on Science: Mr. Hall of Texas, Mr. Gordon of Tennessee, Mr. Costello of Illinois, Mr. Barcia of Michigan, Ms. Johnson of Texas, Ms. Woolsey of California, Ms. Rivers of Michigan, Ms. Lofgren of California, Mr. Doyle of Pennsylvania, Ms. Jackson-Lee of Texas, Mr. Etheridge of North Carolina, Mr. Lampson of Texas, Mr. Larson of Connecticut, Mr. Udall of Colorado, Mr. Wu of Oregon, Mr. Weiner of New York, Mr. Capuano of Massachusetts, Mr. Baird of Washington, Mr. Hoeffel of Pennsylvania, Mr. Moore of Kansas, and Mr. Baca of California;

Committee on Small Business: Ms. Velazquez of New York, Ms. Millender-McDonald of California, Mr. Davis of Illinois, Ms. McCarthy of New York, Mr. Pascrell of New Jersey, Mr. Hinojosa of Texas, Ms. Christensen of the Virgin Islands, Mr. Brady of Pennsylvania, Mr. Udall of New Mexico, Mr. Moore of Kansas, Ms. Tubbs-Jones, Mr. Gonzalez of Texas, Mr. Phelps of Illinois, Ms. Napolitano of California, Mr. Baird of Washington, Ms. Berkley of Nevada, and Mr. Udall of Colorado;

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Mr. Oberstar of Minnesota, Mr. Rahall of West Virginia, Mr. Borski of Pennsylvania, Mr. Lipinski of Illinois, Mr. DeFazio of Oregon, Mr. Clement of Tennessee, Mr. Costello of Illinois, Ms. Norton of the District of Columbia, Mr. Nadler of New York, Mr. Menendez of New Jersey, Ms. Brown of Florida, Mr. Barcia of Michigan, Mr. Filner of California, Ms. Johnson of Texas, Mr. Mascara of Pennsylvania, Mr. Taylor of Mississippi, Ms. Millender-McDonald of California, Mr. Cummings of Maryland, Mr. Blumenauer of Oregon, Mr. Sandlin of Texas, Ms. Tauscher of California, Mr. Pascrell of New Jersey, Mr. Boswell of Iowa, Mr. McGovern of Massachusetts, Mr. Holden of Pennsylvania, Mr. Lampson of Texas, Mr. Baldacci of Maine, Mr. Berry of Arkansas, Mr. Baird of Washington, Ms. Berkley of Nevada, Mr. Carson of Oklahoma, Mr. Matheson of Utah, Mr. Honda of California, and Mr. Larsen of Washington;

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Mr. Evans of Illinois, Mr. Filner of California, Mr. Guterrez of Illinois, Ms. Brown of Florida, Mr. Doyle of Pennsylvania, Mr. Peterson of Minnesota, Mrs. Carson of Indiana, Mr. Reyes of Texas, Mr. Snyder of Arkansas, Mr. Rodriguez of Texas, Mr. Shows of Mississippi, Ms. Berkley of Nevada, Mr. Hill of Indiana, and Mr. Udall of New Mexico;

Committee on Ways and Means: Mr. Rangel of New York, Mr. Stark of California, Mr. Matsui of California, Mr. Coyne of Pennsylvania, Mr. Levin of Michigan, Mr. Cardin of Maryland, Mr. McDermott of Washington, Mr. Kleczka of Wisconsin, Mr. Lewis of Georgia, Mr. Neal of Massachusetts, Mr. McNulty of New York, Mr. Jefferson of Louisiana, Mr. Tanner of Tennessee, Mr. Becerra of California, Ms. Thurman of Florida, Mr. Doggett of Texas, and Mr. Pomeroy of North Dakota.

Mr. FROST (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation from the House of Representatives:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 29, 2001.

Speaker J. DENNIS HASTER, *The U.S. House of Representatives, The Capitol, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER, Attached herewith is a copy of my letter to Governor Tom Ridge of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania stating that my retirement and resignation from the United States Congress shall be effective at 2400 hours, Friday, February 2, 2001.

Sincerely,

BUD SHUSTER,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 29, 2001.

Governor TOM RIDGE, *Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Office of the Governor, Harrisburg, PA.*

DEAR GOVERNOR RIDGE, I hereby submit my letter of retirement and resignation from the United States Congress, effective at 2400 hours, Friday, February 2, 2001.

Sincerely,

BUD SHUSTER,
Member of Congress.

WISHING THE HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, HAPPY BIRTHDAY

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House be on record as wishing the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) a happy birthday and many happy returns.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

MAKING CALIFORNIA WHOLE AGAIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about my City of San

Diego in the State of California and the incredible energy crisis that we are going through. Yes, we are still experiencing it. We have not yet solved it. I have heard comments from Members of this body and the other body, comments from the White House, which seem to indicate an unwillingness to take action to work with California through this crisis.

I say to my colleagues in the Senate and I say to the administration, we are all in this together. If California falls, the rest of the Nation cannot be far behind.

We are the largest State in the union. We have experienced rolling blackouts, utilities on the verge of bankruptcy. If my colleagues do not think this has had an impact on our national economy, listen to Alan Greenspan, as he testified to the Senate just last week. He said that California's crisis is not isolated. It is not an aberration, and it is a problem that the whole Nation must address and must address quickly.

We should pay heed to Mr. Greenspan. And I say to the President, I think the President is going in the wrong direction on this issue. A hands-off approach by the Federal Government, as the President has suggested, is not going to solve this problem.

Yes, we are increasing our generating capacity. Yes, we are redoubling and retripling our efforts to conserve, but an important piece of this problem has been the wholesale prices that have been charged to our utilities and our consumers. The obscene wholesale prices that have been charged.

And only the Federal Government, I say to the President, only the Federal Government, through our Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, has the authority to regulate this wholesale price.

For the President to say that California must solve its own problems ignores the fact that the generators and marketers of electricity, a seven-member monopoly, in fact, that is based in States like Texas, have run up huge, huge profits, 800 percent, 900 percent in their latest reports.

While California, and soon other parts of the Nation, will suffer. Sacramento alone, California alone cannot regulate these wholesalers, I say to the President. This is Washington's responsibility, and it is that responsibility that we must take.

I have a bill just introduced today, the California Electrical Consumers Relief Act of 2001, to take that responsibility head on. In a case like San Diego and California, where FERC has already found, through its investigation, our wholesale rates to be unjust and unreasonable, and, therefore, illegal, illegal, I say to the President, in that situation, my bill would establish what is called cost-based rates. That is the costs of generation plus a reasonable profit, for wholesale electricity, not just in California, but throughout the western States.

This is a regional problem. We must tackle it regionally. It sets those prices retroactively back to last June when this crisis started. This is not a cap. This is not an arbitrary figure.

This is a reasonable rate based on a market-based formula which allows the generators to make a profit, but protects the consumers.

Mr. Speaker, FERC knows how to set those rates. They have the rationale. They have the procedure. They should do it, and we should order it.

For those rates, under my legislation, that were charged above the legal cost-based rates that we have in California and San Diego and have been paying since last June, my bill requires the refund of those obscene profits, the difference between what was charged us and the cost-based rates that FERC determines should be refunded, a billion dollars to the consumers of San Diego, Mr. Speaker. \$12 billion to the State of California.

These were ill-gotten gains by a cartel of the large energy generators and marketers, and that money must be returned to the Californians who are suffering. And as we watch the news and as we listen to what is going on, please remember the Governor of California and the California legislature can do a lot about our State's problems, but they cannot order refunds. They cannot set wholesale prices.

We are stuck in California with the economic disaster that that implies, a billion dollars worth of debt in San Diego, \$12 billion sucked out of our State by these power generators. We cannot look to Sacramento to solve that; only we can do it. I ask President Bush to act, and act quickly. The President cannot take a hands-off approach.

WHY DOES THE MEDIA INSIST UPON REPORTING ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE CONGRESSIONAL REPUBLICAN MAJORITY AND GIVING THE CLINTON ADMINISTRATION CREDIT?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, late last year, a constituent asked me "why do newspapers and TV networks insist upon not reporting the accomplishments of the Congressional Republican majority, or if it is reported, the Clinton administration is given the credit?"

I replied, some do accurately report the facts, but the national media, printed and electronic, with rare exceptions, tilts noticeably to the left.

Mr. Speaker, many Americans, if not most Americans, prefer fair, objective reporting. All too often, again, with rare exceptions, double standards are applied to the detriment of conservative Republicans.

An example of this double-standard mentality is the recently-revealed

Jesse Jackson saga. Had a nationally known conservative Republican religionist fathered a child out of wedlock, a universal firestorm would have likely erupted and, in lieu of a three-day story, it would have endured for several weeks with front page dissemination.

Ironically, Mr. Speaker, African American reporters have been more critical of Mr. Jackson than have many nonblack reporters.

This is an appropriate time, as we begin a new year, it seems to me, for the media to scrap the double standard it has nurtured for so long and embrace a single standard of reporting. If conservative Republicans are taken to the woodshed by the media, then so should liberal Democrats.

The Jesse Jackson case involves not insignificant amounts of money changing hands to the benefit of the mother of Reverend Jackson's child. If the father of this child, in my opinion, were a conservative Republican, media sleuths likely would be developing a money trail to determine the source of these funds. Is such a trail being pursued in the Jackson case? Unlikely.

When this story broke, I heard it said time and again that this story will be summarily dismissed, because Jesse Jackson is too powerful, and no one wants to annoy Reverend Jackson.

While I am attempting to annoy no one, Mr. Speaker, I, however, am employing the national media to submit to a New Year's resolution that, henceforth, conservative Republicans and liberal Democrats be objectively fed from the same journalistic spoon and the Jesse Jackson case is one of several that can serve as a springboard for this purpose.

My criticism of double standard reporting, Mr. Speaker, is directed to the mainstream media, or what is commonly known as the big markets. I am the beneficiary of fair and objective reporting by the media in my congressional district. But fairness and objective political reporting need to be practiced more fully at the national level. If my activities can be reported fairly and objectively within the boundaries of my congressional district, why can it not be done nationally?

I hope this will be forthcoming. Should I hold my breath? I fear that would be ill-advised. Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, I will patiently wait and hope.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

□ 1230

POULTRY FARMERS' EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under a previous order of the

House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. SHOWS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Speaker, the unusually cold winter and the dramatic increase in heating costs are hurting everybody in my State of Mississippi and this country. Clearly we need to encourage more domestic production of oil and gas. But in Mississippi, we need immediate action; we need help today, especially for our region's poultry industry.

Some poultry farmers have seen their gas bills double and triple over last year. This is through no fault of their own since we lost so much to NAFTA, which is a major employer in many of our communities. The poultry industry relies on plentiful and affordable gas heat in the cold winter months.

These days the industry has been devastated by the dramatic rise in the cost of gas. This may not be a natural disaster like a tornado or flood, but this is a disaster just the same. It is an economic disaster that threatens the very existence of farmers throughout our regions.

Yesterday, I introduced a bill that would provide both immediate and long-term emergency assistance to our poultry farmers. My bill, the Poultry Farmers' Emergency Energy Assistance Act, would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide grants that would not have to be repaid to help local producers deal immediately with financial pressures caused by this crisis.

This bill would also make low-interest loans available to poultry farmers to help deal with the energy crisis for the months ahead.

In addition, at my insistence, loan-making officials at the USDA's Farm Service Agency have clarified their regulations so that contract poultry farmers will be eligible for FSA emergency loans.

This important legislation needs to be enacted quickly. Our farmers need help, and they need it now. I am calling upon our leaders in Congress to move this energy assistance bill quickly to passage. I will not rest until the Poultry Farmers' Emergency Energy Assistance Act becomes law.

TRIBUTE TO WILL DWYER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, this is kind of a sad occasion for me. Today I rise to pay tribute to Will Dwyer, who was my former communications director of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. He passed away earlier this month after a long battle with cancer.

He began his media career as a broadcast documentary producer in the 1950s, and then he moved to Washington to start a career in public service. He was a native of Rochester, New

York; and he began his congressional career in the 88th Congress by working for Frank Horton of New York. He served as his administrative assistant for some time.

Then after his stint in public service, he left Washington for the private sector. He returned to Rochester where he held the post of Republican county chairman. During that time, he also founded a telecommunications privacy service.

Will knew that life was too valuable to let a day go by without enjoying everything that it had to offer. He was a man with an incredible thirst for new and different experiences, and he returned to school in mid-life and received his law degree while he was in his mid-40s.

Earlier this decade, Will was called back into public service by the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH). It was on his reputation on Radanovich's staff that we hired him to be our communications director with the Committee on Government Reform.

Although I knew Will for only a short period of time, he was a very, very fine man, a man of impeccable integrity, really cared about this country, a very patriotic fellow. He lived his life knowing that every day was something to savor. It was his attitude that brings me to the floor today to pay tribute to this man whom we are all going to miss a great deal, my friend, Will Dwyer.

So God in heaven, I hope you are blessing Will because he was a man who should be blessed a great deal.

Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD an article that appeared in the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle about the life of my good friend, Will Dwyer, as follows:

[From the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, Jan. 18, 2001]

WILLIAM F. DWYER II DIES OF CANCER AT 65

William F. Dwyer II is described as a dynamo, a restless man, an irrepressible force.

He worked in politics from Monroe County to Washington, D.C., and was a Rochester broadcaster. He got his law degree in his late 40s, spoke on behalf of the tobacco industry, even ran a modular home business in California.

But there was one constant theme in Mr. Dwyer's life—his limitless interest in people. "He was such an egalitarian," said Mr. Dwyer's wife, Constance Drath. "He talked to the grocery clerk, the mailman, the elected officials. He loved learning about everyone."

Mr. Dwyer died of cancer last week in Washington. He was 65.

Mr. Dwyer was born in Rochester on March 30, 1935, and grew up in the city. He graduated from a military academy in New Jersey as the class valedictorian, Drath said.

He returned to Rochester in the mid-1950s and began a career in broadcasting at WHAM-AM (1180). Family and friends say that Mr. Dwyer—a tall man with a curly head of brown hair—had a deep, resonant voice that was perfect for the airwaves.

In 1962, Mr. Dwyer moved to the political arena, going to work for Frank Horton, a Penfield Republican just elected to Congress. He became Horton's administrative assist-

ant, basically his right-hand man, and instituted weekly radio feeds that would be picked up by Rochester radio stations.

Mr. Dwyer also used a radio communications system that kept the Horton campaign in touch with him. "This wasn't done back then," said Horton, who called Mr. Dwyer not just a valued employee but a good friend. "I could tell him anything," Horton said. "You can't say that about everybody."

He left Horton's office in the late 1960s and started a public relations firm that often worked with political campaigns. He worked closely with the Republican Party and in 1970 was named Monroe County chairman of the party.

Richard Rosenbaum, himself a former county GOP chairman, said that Mr. Dwyer's style was "benevolent aggressiveness."

"He was a great PR man, who could make lemonade out of the most awful lemons," he said.

Mr. Dwyer left Rochester for Washington in 1972 and worked in the Nixon and Ford administrations, mainly as a Labor Department spokesman for new workplace safety and health standards.

In 1975, he became a spokesman for the now-defunct Tobacco Institute, which spoke on behalf of cigarette manufacturers.

In 1980, Mr. Dwyer moved to California with Drath. In two years, he obtained his law degree from Southwestern University of Law in Los Angeles. He and Drath opened a law firm in Beverly Hills, specializing in wrongful employment termination cases and immigration issues.

During the 1980s, he dabbled in other ventures, including a modular home company.

In 1994, politics came calling again, and Mr. Dwyer served as a press secretary for Rep. George Radanovich, R-Calif., then as communications director for the House Government Reform Committee.

Through all the changes in his life, Mr. Dwyer remained upbeat and eager for new challenges, Drath said.

"This was a man who knew the art of living in the moment," she said. "He never looked back, never had any regrets."

Along with his wife of Washington, Mr. Dwyer is survived by their two children Scott Dwyer and William Dwyer III of Washington; Elizabeth Sellers of Paris and Geoffrey Dwyer of Brockport, his children from his previous marriage to Eleanor Clarke, now Eleanor Lawton of Brighton; and two sisters, Carol Stearns of Washington, Conn., and Anne Colgan of East Rochester.

A memorial service will be held at Georgetown Presbyterian Church in Washington at noon Wednesday.

Memorial contributions can be made to the National Colorectal Cancer Research Institute at Entertainment Industry Foundation, 11132 Ventura Blvd., Studio City, CA 91604.

TAX DEDUCTION FAIRNESS ACT OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation that will help restore tax fairness to millions of people in my State of Washington and throughout the country. Joining me in this effort today is the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. CLEMENT), my good friend and colleague, who has been instrumental in helping draft this legislation.

The problem we are referring today to, Mr. Speaker, is a basic unfairness in

the current Tax Code. In my home State of Washington and in other States, such as Florida, Nevada, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, and Wyoming, a State sales tax takes the place of a State income tax as the primary means for raising revenue.

Every year in April, taxpayers send their tax returns to the IRS. It is a ritual to which all Americans have become accustomed. Although we do not always like it, we realize it is part of our duties to the country.

But the ritual brings added frustration for taxpayers in my State who feel cheated by what they pay into the Federal Treasury. A taxpayer of identical income and expense in almost any other State would be able to deduct the amount that they pay their State in income tax; but in Washington, we cannot do that.

Folks in my State have the same amount withheld from their paychecks; but when they itemize their taxes, they deduct a significantly lesser amount. Because of the tax reforms of 1986 when lawmakers decided to remove the deduction for sales tax, Washingtonians were shortchanged. In fact, the Congressional Research Service estimates that Washington State taxpayers are penalized to the tune of \$450 million every year when compared to their neighbors.

Should residents of Washington and the other States with sales taxes pay hundreds of dollars more to the Federal Treasury than States which choose to tax residents through income taxes? Of course not.

Federal taxes should be levied on all of our Nation's citizens in a fair and equitable manner that does not give preference to one State or another.

That is why, along with the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. CLEMENT), I am introducing today legislation to correct this inequity. Our bill, the Tax Deduction Fairness Act of 2001, would reinstate the sales tax deduction and direct the IRS to develop tables of average sales tax liabilities for taxpayers in every State. It would then give the taxpayer the option to deduct either their State sales tax or their State income tax when they file their Federal return.

The bill will not make the State or the Federal Income Tax Code more complicated. In fact, it will add one simple line and take about 60 seconds to complete. I do not know about my colleagues, but taking 60 seconds to look on a simple chart in a way that would save me \$400 to \$500 a year is a pretty good investment in time. Adding that line will save hundreds of millions of dollars for American taxpayers every year, and it is all about fundamental fairness.

Let me give my colleagues a couple of very real human examples. Brian and Cathy Lux and their three kids, Carissa, Devon and Tristian, live in Brush Prairie, just outside my home town of Vancouver, Washington. Brian is a finance manager for a local auto

dealership, and his wife, Cathy, is a licensed home care provider.

All told, the Luxes make between \$70,000 to \$80,000 a year, not a huge amount for a family of five. Working with the IRS, my office estimates that the Luxes paid an average of about \$1,700 in sales taxes last year, but they were able to deduct none of it from their Federal return.

However, under our bill, they would get nearly \$500 of their tax money back. For Brian and Cathy, that \$500 would be nearly a month's worth of groceries; or when their kids get a little older, it would be a semester of tuition at the local community college.

Mr. Speaker, now is the time to fix this inequity in the Federal Tax Code for all Brian and Cathy Luxes and for all of the similar families throughout the country.

The new administration campaigned on fair and just tax relief, and I support that promise. But I cannot think of anything more fair than the bill that the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. CLEMENT) and I are introducing today. If we penalize people for being married, so too it must be unjust to penalize people for living in States that opt to tax their citizens through a sales tax. I welcome the bipartisan spirit of the new administration, and I urge members to support this legislation that is all about fairness and simplicity and will help working families throughout this country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. CLEMENT).

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) for yielding and congratulate him because I know that he has been a leader in the State of Washington on this issue, but has also been a leader across the country on this; and it is a pleasure to join forces with him because what we are trying to do is correct inequity, correct tax unfairness.

This came back to us in the 1986 tax reform. Prior to 1986, we were able to deduct our State sales tax from our Federal income tax return. But in the 1986 tax reform, that was taken away from us. It was an oversight, and now we want to correct that oversight once and for all for those seven States that are left out. We should not be forced to move to a State income tax in Tennessee or Washington or the other States if we do not want to.

BANKRUPTCY ABUSE PREVENTION AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the special order to which I am attached today is to announce the introduction of the new bankruptcy reform act that we hope will be enacted into law during this current session and swiftly to arrive at the President's

desk for signature. We are naming the new effort the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2001, and we have over 50 cosponsors already even at the early stages of this session to help us shepherd through much-needed bankruptcy reform.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues will recall that in the waning days of the last session, the House by voice vote and the Senate by an overwhelming vote of 70 to 28 approved the bankruptcy bill of the last term only to have it vetoed by President Clinton in the last days of the congressional session during the year 2000. So we have to start all over again.

In starting all over again, Mr. Speaker, we are adopting as the starting vehicle about 99 and 44/100 percent of the bill that was approved in the last days of the last session by both the House and the Senate, which was of course veto-proof. In the previous House vote, there were 315 votes, well over the veto-proof level, and in the Senate it was 70 over something which also allows for veto override. Happily, we may not require a veto-proof majority in this current session because we believe that bankruptcy reform could be part and parcel of President Bush's overall plan to meet the unstable economy head on to prevent some of the worst consequences of an economic downturn. It fits in perfectly.

Two main themes are part of the new bankruptcy reform effort to which I allude. These same two themes guided our actions from the very beginning. The first theme, and the most important one, is that it is tailored to make certain that anyone who is so overwhelmed by debt, so swamped by the inability to pay one's obligations that that individual after a good close look at his circumstances would be entitled to a fresh start, to be discharged in bankruptcy, to be free of the debts that so overwhelmed him. That is a salient feature of this bankruptcy reform bill and the ones that we were able to get these favorable votes to accomplish in the last two sessions.

So we never lose sight of, nor will we ever lose sight of, the real purpose of bankruptcy reform or any bankruptcy legislation to allow an American citizen the right to gain a fresh start after finding himself incapable of meeting his obligations. But the other tandem theme that is also part of what we have been doing for the last 3 years, and which will be an important feature of the new bill, will be that certain provisions will be put into place which will make certain that those people who have an ability to repay some of their debts will be compelled to do so, so that instead of a Chapter 7 filing which will give that automatic almost-fresh start, we will be able to shepherd some of the debtors into Chapter 13 and propose a plan and adopt a plan by which they could over a period of time repay some of the debt out of their then-current earnings.

This is a well-balanced concept which we are presenting to the American people and to the Congress so that we can help join in the fight to make sure that our economy remains stable throughout the ensuing several years and into the next decade.

Some of the contentious features that we found occurred on the floor of the House and in committee throughout the last 3 years have been so well settled now and are part and parcel of the new proposal that we believe that only a modicum of new hearings will be needed either in the Senate or in the House for final resolution of the final wording that will go into the bankruptcy reform bill to which we refer. We had some 13 hearings within a year to determine what was out there in the business world and in the consumer world that was important enough for us to note and to provide language to accommodate.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking for cosponsorship.

I am proud to introduce H.R. 333, the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2001, today together with original cosponsors from both sides of the aisle.

This bill is identical to the conference report that accompanied H.R. 2415, the Geras-Grassley Bankruptcy Reform Act of 2000, which passed the House by voice vote last October and passed the Senate with a veto-proof vote of 70 to 28 less than 2 months ago. The only revisions consist of a title change and the deletion of a provision that has already become law.

This bill is a further perfection of its predecessor, H.R. 833, the Bankruptcy Reform Act of 1999, which I introduced on February 24, 1999. With more than 100 cosponsors, H.R. 833 had overwhelming bipartisan support in the House as further evidenced by a vote on final passage of 313 to 108.

The bill I am introducing today consists of a comprehensive package of reforms pertaining to consumer and business bankruptcy law. It also includes provisions regarding the treatment of tax claims, enhanced data collection, and international insolvencies.

This bill responds to several developments affecting bankruptcy law and practice. Based on data released by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, bankruptcy filings have increased exponentially. Between 1994 and 1998, the number of filed bankruptcy cases grew by more than 72 percent. In 1998, bankruptcy filings, according to the Administrative Office, reached an "all-time high" of more than 1.4 million cases. Paradoxically, however, this dramatic increase in bankruptcy filing rates occurred during a period when the economy continued to be robust, with relatively low unemployment and high consumer confidence.

Coupled with this development was the release of a study that estimated financial losses in 1997 resulting from these bankruptcy filings exceeded \$44 billion, a loss equal to more than \$400 per household. This study projected that even if the growth rate in personal bankruptcies slowed to only 15 percent over the next 3 years, the American economy would have to absorb a cumulative cost of more than \$220 billion.

The Judiciary Committee began its consideration of comprehensive bankruptcy reform

early in the 105th Congress. On April 16, 1997, the Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law conducted a hearing on the operation of the bankruptcy system that was combined with a status report from the National Bankruptcy Review Commission. This was the first of 13 hearings that the subcommittee held on the subject of bankruptcy reform over the ensuing 2 years. Eight of these hearings were devoted solely to consideration of H.R. 833 and its predecessor, H.R. 3150, the Bankruptcy Reform Act of 1998. Over the course of these hearings, more than 120 witnesses, representing nearly every major constituency in the bankruptcy community, testified. With regard to H.R. 833 alone, testimony was received from 69 witnesses, representing 23 organizations, with additional material submitted by other individuals and groups.

The heart of the bill's consumer bankruptcy reforms is the implementation of a mechanism to ensure that consumer debtors repay their creditors the maximum that they can afford. The needs-based formula articulates objective criteria so that debtors and their counsel can self-evaluate their eligibility for relief under chapter 7 (a form of bankruptcy relief where the debtor generally receives a discharge of his or her personal liability for most unsecured debts). These reforms are not intended to affect consumer debtors lacking the ability to repay their debts and deserving of an expeditious fresh start.

The bill's debtor protections include significant new credit card disclosure specifications and the requirement that billing statements and other related materials contain explanatory statements with regard to introductory interest rates and minimum payments. These additional disclosures will give debtors important information to enable them to better manage their financial affairs so that they can avoid fiscal disaster.

Important reforms intended to help debtors understand their rights and obligations with respect to reaffirmation agreements are also included in the legislation. To enforce these protections, the bill requires the Attorney General to designate a U.S. attorney for each judicial district and a FBI agent for each field office to have primary responsibility regarding abusive reaffirmation practices, among other responsibilities.

In addition, the legislation substantially expands a debtor's ability to exempt certain tax-qualified retirement accounts and pensions. It also creates a new provision that allows a consumer debtor to exempt certain education IRA and state tuition plans for his or her child's postsecondary education from the claims of creditors.

Most importantly, the legislation's credit counseling provisions will give consumers in financial distress an opportunity to learn about the consequences of bankruptcy—which can be very devastating to their credit rating, among other matters—and about alternatives to bankruptcy, as well as how to manage their finances, so that they can avoid future financial difficulties.

Other debtor protections include heightened requirements for those professionals and others who assist consumer debtors in connection with their bankruptcy cases, expanded notice requirements for consumers with regard to alternatives to bankruptcy relief, and the institution of a pilot program to study the effective-

ness of consumer financial education for debtors. The legislation also addresses a problem under the current law with respect to those individuals who are precluded from obtaining bankruptcy relief because they simply cannot afford to pay the requisite bankruptcy filing fees and related charges. Under the legislation, these fees and charges may be waived in appropriate cases.

With regard to business bankruptcy reform, the bill addresses the special problems that small business cases present by instituting a variety of performance criteria and enforcement mechanisms to identify and weed out those debtors who are unable to reorganize. It also requires more active supervision of these cases by United States Trustees and the bankruptcy courts. The bill includes provisions dealing with business bankruptcy cases, in general, and family farmer bankruptcies, in particular. It also clarifies the treatment of certain financial contracts under the banking laws as well as under the Bankruptcy Code. The bill responds to the special needs of family farmers by making chapter 12 of the Bankruptcy Code—a form of bankruptcy relief available only to eligible family farmers—permanent.

The small business and single asset real estate provisions of the bill are largely derived from consensus recommendations of the National Bankruptcy Review Commission. Many of these recommendations received broad support from those in the bankruptcy community, including various bankruptcy judges, creditor groups, and the Executive Office for United States Trustees.

The bill, in addition, contains several provisions having general impact with respect to bankruptcy law and practice. These include a provision permitting certain appeals from final bankruptcy court decisions to be heard directly by the court of appeals for the appropriate circuit. Another general provision of the bill requires the Executive Office for United States Trustees to compile various statistics regarding chapter 7, 11, and 13 cases, to make these data available to the public, and to report annually to Congress on the data collected.

It is also important to note that the legislation includes a plethora of provisions intended to protect the interests of women and children. For example, the legislation—

Gives domestic support obligations the highest entitlement to payment in bankruptcy cases where there are assets available to pay the claims of creditors. Current law only accords a seventh level payment priority to these claims.

Establishes a uniform and expanded definition of the term "domestic support obligation" to better protect the rights of women and children with support claims and to reduce litigation.

Prevents deadbeat parents from enjoying the benefits of bankruptcy relief without having first satisfied their spousal and child support obligations.

Ensures that bankruptcy cannot be used by deadbeat parents to interfere with the enforcement efforts of federal, state and local authorities with respect to overdue child support obligations.

Ensures that bankruptcy cannot be used by deadbeat parents to interfere with the enforcement efforts of federal, state and local authorities with respect to overdue child support obligations.

Does not allow deadbeat parents to discharge other obligations relating to divorce or separation agreements.

Requires those who are responsible for the administration of bankruptcy cases to provide important information and notices to their holders of spousal or child support claims as well as to state child support agencies.

Many professionals and organizations responsible for federal child support enforcement programs such as the National District Attorneys Association, the National Association of Attorneys General, and the National Child Support Enforcement Association (which represents more than 60,000 child support professionals across America) have enthusiastically expressed their support for these important reforms.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 333, the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2001.

□ 1245

SUPPORT SALES TAX DEDUCTION ACT OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. CLEMENT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of a bill that the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) and myself have worked so hard on and we are introducing today that would restore the sales tax deduction to the Federal Income Tax Code. We are talking about an oversight that occurred in 1986, where seven States cannot deduct their State sales tax from their Federal income tax return, which they could do prior to 1986. This is an issue of tax fairness that has been wrongly denied to the citizens of Tennessee and six other States for 15 years.

Mr. Speaker, due to the elimination of the State sales tax deduction from the Federal Tax Code in 1986, the people of Tennessee are paying significantly more in taxes to the Federal Government than a taxpayer with an identical profile in a State that does have a State income tax. In the last fiscal year alone, my colleagues, my friends, constituents in Tennessee, paid an average of \$727 in State sales taxes but could not deduct \$1 of it from their Federal income tax return. We are being forced to pay taxes on our taxes. This is unfair, it is unjust, and it must be corrected here in the 107th Congress. The people of Tennessee and the other States deserve better from the Federal Government.

Our bill is very simple. It would allow taxpayers to deduct their State sales taxes from their Federal income tax return. Those living in a State with an income tax would be completely unaffected, since they would still be able to take an income tax deduction as they do today. For example, a family with a combined income of \$50,000 that lives in Tennessee, for example, who are blessed with beautiful twin daughters

would save \$350. That, Mr. Speaker, is a lot of diapers.

I am calling on my colleagues to take this opportunity to restore fairness and equity to the Tax Code in this Congress without making the Tax Code more complex and without abandoning our fiscal discipline. In a year when all the talk now is about bipartisan tax cuts and bipartisan tax reform, I say we come together and pass tax fairness and ensure tax equity now. Let us take this opportunity to do something about our tax burdens and not just talk about them.

In this last Congress, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) and myself were able to offer it on the floor of the House, and 173 of our colleagues voted in favor of similar tax language. I would like to call on those Members of the House to cosponsor this legislation. It is a fair bill, it makes a lot of sense, and it will treat all States equal. Is that not what it is all about, when we call ourselves the United States of America?

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to have a colloquy with my good friend and a real leader in the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee, and I want to commend him for his efforts on this bill and for his fight for fairness for his citizens.

It really is this simple. What we propose is to have the IRS create simple tables. A person will not have to save their receipts in a shoe box or keep track of all their expenditures. They will simply look on a simple table. On the left column is their income, the top row is the family size. They will find where that intersects and that is the amount they put on their tax form. Literally, 30 seconds to a minute for fundamental fairness, for a bill that will save the average working family, who itemizes their deductions, between \$300 to \$500 every year.

The \$500 million that Washington State taxpayers paid to the Federal treasury could have been spent on their families, their kids' educations, and in a lot of other ways. I am sure it is true in Tennessee as well.

Mr. CLEMENT. The gentleman is absolutely right. And I have heard so many people in Tennessee say why not? We should not have been overlooked in 1986. I know neither one of us were in Congress when that happened, when they passed the 1986 tax reform, but the fact is someone did not fight for us. Someone did not fight for those seven States.

I know some of those northeastern Congressmen say, well, we wanted to make sure that if an individual lived in a State with a State income tax that they could deduct that from their Federal income tax returns. Well, treat us fairly as well, where we can deduct some taxes from our Federal income tax return, so we have fairness and equity for all in the United States.

FAITH-BASED INITIATIVES A PRIORITY WITH PRESIDENT BUSH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SOUDER. Earlier this week, President George Bush announced his faith-based initiatives office and different proposals that he will be sending down to Congress. Earlier today, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS), who has been a leader in this effort, and Senator RICK SANTORUM, along with the gentlewoman from Kentucky (Mrs. NORTHUP) and myself, and Senators TIM HUTCHINSON and SAM BROWNBACK held a press conference with a number of leaders from Michigan, Florida, and other places around the United States to highlight some of these initiatives.

There are a number of questions that I wanted to address here as we prepare to analyze and hopefully report the President's package and add different things we have considered here in the House and Senate to it as well.

First and foremost, this is not a new idea. Former Congressman and Senator Dan Coats, when he was in the House, had a number of these initiatives. In the Senate, the Agenda for American Renewal. Former Secretary of Housing and Urban Development Secretary Jack Kemp had a number of faith-based initiatives there because a lot of people would not reach out and care for those with AIDS. In the early stages of the AIDS crisis, as people were dying, there were all sorts of false rumors around and many people did not care for them. Without the faith-based communities, if the government had not reached out to the faith-based communities and involved them, there would have been many people dying of AIDS who would not have received any assistance whatsoever. Nobody objected to the faith-based communities coming and working.

Similarly in homelessness, the Federal dollars, the State dollars, and the local dollars were not enough to address the homeless questions. So, under HUD, they expanded into the faith-based organizations back in the Bush administration. That was continued under Secretary Cisneros and continued under Secretary Cuomo. It is not fair to say that these things are suddenly new and that President Bush is trying to insert religion into the national debate. It has been there. The difference is, instead of an afterthought, President Bush wants to make it a focus. He is saying that all these flowering organizations that are developed in every neighborhood, particularly those that are hurting the most, there are people making a difference and we need to tap into that.

Now, a second question that comes up is, well, these examples that are brought forth and are talked about at press conferences or that are talked about by Gene Rivers in Boston or Freddie Garcia in San Antonio, they

are just exceptions. They are not the rules. We could not possibly make this program work on a large scale because, while there are a few people here and there toiling away, this cannot possibly be part of an integrated strategy. That is just false.

The largest city in my district is Fort Wayne, Indiana. I want to give an example of the breadth of what we are talking about here. Reverend Bill McGill was executive director of Stop the Madness. After one pastor's son was shot in the center city of Fort Wayne while he was sitting at a YMCA and two guys got in a gun fight, he decided to form an organization called Stop the Madness. Bill McGill headed that organization. Now he is executive director of One Church, One Offender. We have churches throughout north-east Indiana and Fort Wayne in particular who are working to adopt people who have gotten in trouble with the law and who are now coming out. Who is going to help them get a job and work with them? This is a tremendous program.

The Ewell Wilson Center was started by Shirley Woods and her husband after their boy, who was a star athlete, was shot. She has a community center now who works with kids. It is disconcerting that she has to fight for every little game unit, for every computer, for every little thing because she is not a high-powered organization. It is just a couple of people who said we care about the kids in our area. They do not have grant writers or the so-called beltway bandits. How can people making a difference at the grass roots level do it?

Reverend Jessey and Anthony Beasley came to me. They have an inner-city church and they are trying to figure out how to get a youth program started for the after-school kids because we have a huge crack problem in Fort Wayne and a high murder rate, and they do not know where to turn to do that.

George Middleton took some of his savings out to help build a youth center, and he is building this with his private money and getting volunteers in. But he can only do so much. And when someone does not get the help, they get tired too fast. They are working 18 hours a day. Here are the people who are actually doing it in the ZIP code where they live and we cannot get the dollars to them.

Friends of mine, Barb and Lonnie Cox, had their family touched and friends touched by the drug problem, so they went to the bishop and through the parish there they formed a house to reach people who have been battling drug addiction.

There is Father Glenn Kohrman in Fort Wayne. We have an influx of Burmese come in, as they have had a conflict in that country. We have programs for people of Spanish language, often through faith-based organizations because often they are involved in the Catholic church or Pentecostal

churches, but in this case, in the Asian community, we did not have any direct funds where the Catholic church could figure out how to do English as a second language to a subgroup.

This is what President Bush is talking about. We have lots of people already there; we have lots more interested, but they have not had access to it. I congratulate the President for making this a foremost priority rather than an afterthought.

HONORING THE LIFE OF OLIVE WEHBRING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Olive Wehbring. Communities are indeed fortunate to have political activists who choose to devote their time to the cause of good government after they retire from a paid career. It is rare when that commitment to public issues becomes another 30-year career. Olive Wehbring, who passed away recently in San Diego at the age of 95, was just such an exemplary citizen.

When I was a young mother and new board member of the San Diego League of Women Voters, I was delighted to meet Olive and to be introduced by her and to the intricacies of local government. She was a model for several generations of League of Women Voters leaders. Her enthusiasm was matched by tireless perseverance and sitting through long meetings, whether they be a county health committee, a regional planning meeting of the San Diego Association of Governments, or a city planning commission hearing. In fact, she attended a meeting of regional planners only 3 months before she died from complications of breast cancer.

Three years ago, I had the opportunity to speak at a State League of Women Voters convention in San Diego, and Olive, well over 90 years old, appeared at the meeting. She had volunteered all morning at the registration table, driven 10 miles home to check on her cat during lunch, drove back downtown, parked, and walked several blocks in time for the afternoon session.

Olive's energy was legendary. Her spirit indomitable and her intellect unsparing. She served as President of the League of Women Voters of San Diego County in 1981, and for the city league she authored a guide to the city's structure and operation. Mrs. Wehbring was also active in the Church of the Good Samaritan, where she served as clerk of the vestry and as head of the Altar Guild.

Olive was born here in Washington, D.C. but grew up in New York. After graduating in 1927 from Smith College, where she was a competitive swimmer, she became a reference librarian. Managing the reference department for a li-

brary in White Plains, New York, she earned a Master's Degree in library science in 1955 from Columbia University. In New York, Olive served as President of the United Nations Association of Westchester County and on the board of the Westchester Mental Health Association.

□ 1300

After moving in 1970 to the newly developed University City area of San Diego with her late husband Leon, she became a member of the University City Planning Board. As the University of California San Diego grew, the area expanded with diverse business, scientific research, and high-density residential buildings. Olive became a watchdog for good growth policies to tailor the growth of the community.

Olive Wehbring will be missed by many community members, as well as her daughter Brenda Holman of San Diego, her sons John of San Diego and Kurt of Portland, Oregon, and her five grandchildren and ten great-grandchildren. She will always have a special place in my heart and the hearts of many women for whom she was a role model and mentor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

EDUCATION PLAN OF PRESIDENT BUSH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support as well as concerns regarding President Bush's education plan. The plan represents a comprehensive and broad-reaching initiative, which is expected to gain the support of both sides of the aisle and both Houses of Congress. And it deserves it. But I must raise the reality that the U.S. territories, like Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa and the Northern Marianas are not even mentioned.

There is no mention in the President's proposal regarding the treatment of territories. It is not unusual that territories are often overlooked and sometimes misrepresented in the crafting of national policy. But when national policies have ambitious titles and objectives, the territories should not be overlooked.

The goal of President Bush's plan is that no child be left behind. I would like to restate that goal so that it rings clear to everyone. No child in America should be left behind. And that should include all American children no matter where they live.

I would like to emphasize the special needs of public schools in the territories, which, apart from the remoteness from the U.S. mainland, share in the same struggle to meet the basic needs of operating a school system. But due to our geography, we face special challenges in maintenance, school construction, acquisition of school supplies and equipment, recruitment and training of professionals.

In Guam, we face the additional burden of dealing with typhoons in an unforgiving tropical environment, unforgiving for buildings, that is. The people of Guam have crafted a reasonable 10-year plan for the system's infrastructure, and we look to Federal programs and unique bonding arrangements which will jump-start our effort to bring Guam schools into the 21st century.

The territories are generally included in most national programs, but only as afterthoughts and educators in Guam must follow a patchwork system of funding arrangements and frequent bureaucratic indifference in order to obtain needed and fair funding. This was the message conveyed to me in a meeting last week with Guam's top-level administrators in the Department of Education.

We also frequently try to apply national programs to our local jurisdictions which face very different and difficult circumstances. It is for this reason that territorial school systems which have a unique relationship with the Federal Government deserve special consideration and mention in the President's plan and any plan which leaves Congress.

As stated in Title VI of the President's proposal, "The Federal Government has a special obligation to certain schools that educate the children of families who serve in the U.S. military and those that educate Native American children." This initiative to rebuild schools for Native Americans and children of military families should be extended to all territories, as all territories have a unique relationship with the Federal Government.

As an educator by training, and my mother is an educator and my wife is an educator and my daughter is an educator, I must also state a concern about the emerging nature of the accountability to mention the President's proposal. I am concerned about the overreliance of testing as the only measure of educational success. Guam schools, like many other school districts in the Nation, are struggling to meet very basic needs and have a very diverse student body and we need to account for different ways of measuring success.

I believe in standards and agree that the failure to include high standards will mean that schools will not meet designated goals. But we must think about other ways to measure the school environment than simple reliance on standardized testing, just that alone.

As a former educator, I give President Bush high marks for introducing a comprehensive educational measure at the beginning of his administration. This demonstrates his solid commitment to improve education in public schools for all American children. I know my colleagues in the territories will agree that this administration and this Congress should work in concert to move our Nation's educational agenda forward so that no child is left behind whether they live in Los Angeles or Washington, D.C., Hagatna or Yara.

I urge my fellow colleagues and President Bush to consider the special needs of U.S. territories as we work in crafting an educational plan that truly meets the needs of all Americans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. MINK of Hawaii addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

WELL WISHES TO HON. BUD SHUSTER ON HIS DEPARTURE FROM HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, this is the last day for the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), one of the most dynamic experts on transportation in the entire country. There has been no individual that has had more of an impact on transportation in Pennsylvania, in the commonwealth in his district, in my district, in the entire country.

He was an expert in the field. Even when he was in the minority, he had a tremendous impact on transportation things. He convinced the Congress and the White House that the taxes we collect for transportation ought to go to transportation; and, even against tremendous odds, he was able to win that battle.

It will be a long time before we see another person with his ability. He was a Ph.D with a Phi Beta Kappa. He was an Army veteran. He was a person of great compassion, and sometimes it was overshadowed by things that he was interested in.

But I will say this, that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) will be long remembered for all the things that he did in Pennsylvania and for his legacy and there will be a better transportation system in this great country. And that is absolutely essential to our economic progress.

Mr. MASCARA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of the finest sons of Pennsylvania: Chairman BUD SHUSTER.

BUD, your commitment and vision has reshaped our national landscape from the local level to the national level.

In 1995, when I took the oath of office and won a seat on the T&I Committee, you were beginning your 12th term as a Congressman and first year as Chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. Little did

I realize that under your leadership the Committee would become the most productive Congress has ever seen. A large measure of your success can be attributed to your fair treatment and respect for the minority members of the Committee.

We as a nation are extremely lucky to have had you working to build the Transportation and Environmental infrastructure of our nation. Because of your efforts, I do not believe the American people will ever again accept inadequate funding for our Waterways, Railways, Airways, and Highways.

Personally, I want to thank you for helping with many projects in my district. I am particularly grateful for your visit to my district to view the efforts being made to complete the Mon-Fayette and Southern Beltway Transportation Projects. Once completed, this project has the economic potential to revive the economy for the hard working men and women of southwestern Pennsylvania.

It has been an honor and pleasure to work with you on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. Although I am certain you are looking forward to other pursuits, you will be sadly missed by me personally and your colleagues on the Committee.

As you plan for your future, let me assure you that you have a friend in FRANK MASCARA. I wish you the best of everything.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks about the retirement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

CONSUMER ONLINE PRIVACY AND DISCLOSURE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in the remarks of my colleague. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) has been very fair and worked on transportation not only, obviously, in Pennsylvania but all over the country. His presence will be missed.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today, though, to talk about a bill I just introduced, the Consumer Online Privacy and Disclosure Act.

Unprecedented numbers of American consumers are flocking to the Internet to transact business and tap the nearly limitless informational databases that are available. The explosion in Internet usage, however, is not without its problems.

Unlike shopping in a mall or browsing through a library where individuals travel anonymously through the merchandise racks and library stacks, the Internet is becoming less and less anonymous. Direct marketing firms

are now trying to identify individuals as they surf the Web to isolate where they visit and what they are viewing.

This new data collection practice is most often described as Internet profiling. Internet profiling describes the practice of joining a consumer's personal information with that of his or her Internet viewing habits. To develop this detail profile, a "persistent cookie" must be attached to the consumer's cookie as they move through a Web site.

A persistent cookie is a small text file copied for varying lengths of time to consumers' computers to track their movements while they are online. It is almost like somebody following you on the street, Mr. Speaker; and we have protections against that.

My legislation would prohibit Internet Service Providers (ISP) and Web site operators from allowing third parties to attach these persistent cookies to a consumer's computer without his or her knowledge and consent. And that is the biggest purpose. If someone wants to give their consent, then that is their business.

For example, we have these grocery cards all over the country that gives us a discount. We understand that by taking that discount that Safeway or Kroeger's or someone else is actually seeing what we buy at the grocery store. We agree to that in a way.

The legislation requires the Federal Trade Commission, the FTC, to promulgate rules specifying that all operators of a Web site or online service provide a clear and conspicuous notice of their privacy policy in clear, non-legalistic terms.

The bill also requires a Web site or online service to provide consumers with an option to prevent the use of their personal information for any activity other than the particular transaction. And finally, the privacy policy must clearly state how any information, collected information will be shared or transferred to an external company or third party.

While my legislation gives consumers more information and control over how they use the Internet, I have also included a provision that will hold e-commerce companies to their privacy policies.

With insolvency of many dot-com companies, oftentimes the only tangible asset left to satisfy creditors is a consumer's transaction and personal information.

The global use of the Internet is beneficial only so long as the information traveling through cyberspace remains private. Consumers will pull back from this burgeoning information and commerce tool if they believe their privacy is being invaded.

While I understand there are many differing approaches to the use of Internet privacy, I believe this legislation addresses a critical component of Internet privacy debate; and I look forward in working with this Congress, Mr. Speaker, also to make sure that

our constituents have that privacy that they expect and also that they will think they have.

THE THREE R'S PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to come before the Chamber today to talk about what is the most important issue facing our country today and certainly in the future, education: How can we prepare our children to become adults with the skills and the knowledge that they need to succeed and compete in the world today. It is a challenge that we are presently not meeting to the degree that we should, and it starts with K-12 education.

Right now we are losing too many students before they even make it through high school, too many students who are not developing the skills and the learning experiences that they need. How can we go about fixing that problem?

Well, for the most part, this is a local issue. This is something that States, school districts and local communities are going to be the primary drivers on in terms of fixing the problems, investing the resources and making the decisions. And I think we should keep that in mind, as the United States Congress, that we want to make sure that we empower the locals to do the job that they are in the best position to do.

But the Federal Government does have a role. There is a lot of people that say that the Federal Government does not have any business being involved in K-12 education because it is a State and local issue, period. I disagree.

On the single-most important issue facing our country, the quality of our child's education, I think all taxpayers would like to know that some of that money that they pay in taxes to the Federal Government is going to help improve our K-12 education system since it is such an important issue to all of us.

But the question that we are addressing here today is, what is the proper role for the Federal Government? How can they best use the money that they spend?

Right now the Federal Government is responsible for about 7 percent of the school district's budget. Are we getting the most we can for those dollars? Are those dollars going to the right places? Are they coming with the proper amount of flexibility? I do not think so.

Myself and a number of colleagues of mine have introduced a bill on education called the Three R's bill. The gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) and others have cospon-

sored this to try to shift the focus of the Federal role in education to improve it and to make it work better. There are some basic principles that we want to outline today that we are headed towards on this program.

First and foremost is we do need to make an increased investment in education. And have a chart here that lays out what our goals and priorities are, and that is the first time.

There are many people that would like to believe, I guess, that we do not need to spend more money to make education better. And I will agree that we do not need to only spend more money, we have to make it more efficient, more effective and more accountable as well. But when we look at our crumbling classrooms in one end of this country to the other, the crushing need for school construction, at the coming shortage of teachers that we have, at the growing class sizes, at the growing needs for technology in our schools, there is no question that we as a Nation need to make a greater investment in K-12 education, and that is something that we ought to start with.

But the other thing is, when we are looking at the Federal Government, where should we send our money? Those Federal dollars should be targeted to help where we can best help, and that is driving those dollars out to the communities that are in poverty, to the poorer communities that frankly do not have the same access to education that other communities have.

If they live in a wealthy or tax-rich community, they have a number of options for funding the programs that they need in school. If they do not, they do not have as many options, they cannot simply raise a \$100,000 from the parents or pass a levy or bond issue to generate those dollars.

□ 1315

The Federal Government should target their dollars that they send to get to those poor communities. We do not do a good enough job of that right now. Too many of those dollars are not going to the communities that truly need them. Our bill adjusts those formulas to drive them out primarily based on need, based on those poverty-based communities that we are headed towards.

The other major problem of the Federal role in education right now is that it is too bureaucratic and there are too many strings attached to those dollars that are sent out. That is a problem in a couple of different areas. First of all there is insufficient flexibility. The needs of one school district may not necessarily be the same as another. The needs in Seattle may not be the same as Chicago or Spokane or South Bend, Indiana, there may be differences in what they want, but the Federal Government is very prescriptive in how we send the dollars out. They have to be spent in a certain way. That reduces the flexibility of those local communities to best use those dollars. But the

other problem with it is the bureaucratic nightmare that goes with it.

The way the Federal structure is currently set up, there is somewhere in the neighborhood of 60 different Federal programs, pots of money of varying sizes that all school districts in the country have to compete for. They fill out grants to go get these dollars. There are a whole series of problems with this process. First of all, the communities that need these dollars the most, the poor, the rural communities, they do not have the money for grant writers. They are struggling just to provide the educators they need in their school districts. So it becomes a snowball effect. They do not have the money to hire the grant writers so they cannot get the additional money the Federal Government is providing and the dollars do not get driven out where they are truly needed. But even in communities that have large school districts, you do not want your school district personnel to be grant writers. You want them to be educators.

There is a school district in my congressional district that estimates in 1 year they spent 900 person-hours filling out Federal grants for money. Think of what those 900 person-hours could have been better used for to help educate our children. We need to give them that flexibility and freedom from the grant writing that is currently required of so many school districts. We drive our dollars out in a way that does not require that, that gives them that greater flexibility and lifts them away from that bureaucracy.

The last issue I want to touch on is accountability. As I mentioned, we certainly need to invest more in education. But we also need more accountability, more effective results. The biggest reason for that is you cannot fix a failing school. You cannot educate a child that is not learning to read or write or develop the math skills that he or she needs if you are not aware of it. If we are not measuring the results of our schools and our students, we do not know where they are at. Now, this is something that should be State driven, no question. But I believe it should be the policy of the Federal Government to require States to keep track of how their schools are performing, so that parents can know what is going on and so that, most importantly, we can meet the needs as they come up. So that is another important part of our bill is we require States to measure performance at least three times during the course of K-12 education. In my home State of Washington, we do it in the fourth, seventh, and tenth grade. Different States do it at different places, but there needs to be a measurement so we know how the schools are doing.

But the second most important part about accountability is the part that I think we are doing the weakest job on as a country, and, that is, once you find out the schools that are not succeeding, the students that are not suc-

ceeding, what do you do about it? Are you then investing and making the changes necessary to fix the problem? It is nice to know, but it is far more important to get in there and fix the problem so that all of us, all of our children, have access to a quality education. What our bill does is it requires that measurement and then once you find out what schools are not performing, we set aside money for the States to go into those specific schools and improve them and make them work better, to get the results that we need.

Our bill is a significant change in Federal education policy. It is a change that reflects the need to spend more money certainly but to target those dollars in an appropriate place, to increase local flexibility so that they are not filling out Federal paperwork but, rather, educating our children and to have accountability, to measure results so that we know how our children are doing, how our schools are doing, so hopefully we can step up and improve them. I feel there is no more important issue that this Congress will deal with. I am pleased that the President has shown an indication to move in this direction. We have some differences on the proposal that he has outlined. But we also have a lot of similarities. I think there is a good chance that this Congress will make a significant change in education policy.

With that, I am joined by several colleagues today who are cosponsors of this bill and share with me in our desire to get it passed and change this role. I would first like to call on the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. SHOWS).

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH). We appreciate that so much.

I am glad to say, Mr. Speaker, the national debate has shifted to our American system of education. Recently, President Bush offered a comprehensive education package. I am glad priorities concerning education are taking the national stage now, because improving our schools makes all our lives better.

The President's proposal has much merit, but let me tell my colleagues about another education proposal and that is what the gentleman from Washington is talking about today, the Three R's Act. This bill demonstrates that both parties are willing to invest more in education and support strong accountability measures. The Three R's bill streamlines the Federal bureaucracy, allows for more local control, increases funding for poor schools and allows for more teacher and principal hiring and recruitment. The Three R's Act actually streamlines 50 Federal programs into five performance-based grants. It also provides for more resources to schools with high concentrations of poor children to help States meet their new performance goals. This will also be of particular benefit for my State, Mississippi.

I recently released a report conducted about class sizes in our congressional district. The gentleman was talking about it earlier. The study revealed that over 80 percent of young children in these grades were taught in classrooms that exceeded the national goal of 18 students per classroom. That is in my district. It is important that some of the funds from the Three R's Act or any education bill go to help reduce class sizes. Smaller class sizes have been proven to increase student achievement, reduce discipline problems and increase the amount of instructional time teachers are able to spend with students. Class size reduction has the strongest effects on children in kindergarten through third grade. A study conducted in Tennessee, for example, revealed that in the fourth grade, students from the smaller classes still outperformed the students from the larger classes in all academic subjects.

In order to have a comprehensive solution to ensuring that our children receive a quality education, we must invest in school construction and modernization, mental health professionals and more guidance counselors in our schools, technology in the classrooms and smaller class sizes.

With smaller class sizes, a teacher can better identify the needs of the students, provide individual attention, and spend less time on disciplinary matters. I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues in Congress on an education bill that will strengthen our education system for the 21st century.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) who serves on the Committee on Education and the Workforce and has been a leader on education policy for the full decade he has been in Congress and is one of the prime drivers behind this legislation.

Mr. ROEMER. I appreciate the very kind words from my good friend and fellow New Democrat from the State of Washington (Mr. SMITH). I want to applaud him for his hard work on this bill over the past year and a half. I want to thank the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. SHOWS) for the eloquence in his statement. We will be joined by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) to talk about education as well from his vantage point on the Committee on Education and the Workforce where he has joined me working on these efforts for the past several years.

I also want to commend all the New Democrats that have worked so hard on education legislation over the past several years. We have a host of people that dedicate their careers in public service to trying to improve opportunities for young children, for people that are going back to school, whether they be 28 or 48 years old, to get a better education, whether it be a nontraditional student at 33 years old going to a community college. We are interested in working in areas to improve

education for Americans across the country. The New Democrat Coalition has been a driving force to try to come up with these new ideas, to try to work with the Senate where, with this particular bill, the Three R's, we have worked with Senator BAYH, my colleague from Indiana, and Senator LIEBERMAN from Connecticut to craft this legislation. And where we look to work in a bipartisan way with our fellow Republicans across the aisle, with the new administration and with all those people across the country that continue to say that education is the single most important issue across America.

You can go into a small business or a large business and the first thing out of their mouth is education, to improve productivity. You can go into a labor union and talk to people about training opportunities and apprenticeship programs and the first word is improving education. You can talk about Democrats and Republicans, the Bush administration, the former Clinton administration, the nexus is here, the rivers are all coming together for us to finally work in a bipartisan way to achieve some much-needed results in improving public education in this country.

Now, we are 2 years behind, ladies and gentlemen, 2 years behind in reauthorizing the most important education bill where there is a partnership between the Federal Government and our local schools, locally driven. I might add, for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. We have proposed a bill that the gentleman from Washington has just very, very quickly outlined, and done it very well. That I think is a very, very good starting point and a possible ending point, for good bipartisan legislation to reauthorize the ESEA proposal. Let me outline two or three major components of this bill and then maybe touch on a brief area of disagreement with the Bush administration, and then conclude with the importance of resources and investment for public education in this country.

First of all, what we do in this Three R's education proposal which has been dropped today, I think the number will probably be H.R. 345, is we consolidate a number, 50 to 60 Federal programs, down to five competitive Federal grants. These five areas, including title I for the poorest children; teacher quality to improve on the number of people going into the teaching profession and coming out, maybe going in at mid career; we talk about public school choice and expanding choice to empower more parents. Those are the five critical areas to consolidate and make sure that these decisions are not driven by Washington, D.C. but are driven by the local community with help and assistance from the Federal Government.

Secondly, we demand more accountability and results from our schools, from every teacher, from every single child, to make sure that they can live

up to the standards and the requirements of this new economy, so that they can meet the needs upon graduation from high school that are going to be needed by our businesses, by our unions, by our hospitals and our banks, so that they make certain requirements and that diploma is meaningful coming out of high school, that diploma means they have met certain assessments and skill levels, but that we do not also overtest and put a Federal mandate on our local schools. There is a delicate balance that we try to reach in this bill between recognizing the needs to test our students and demand more from our students but also not give unfunded mandates to our local schools.

Thirdly, and I will talk about this a little bit more, we target new resources, new investments, new opportunities to some of the poorest children in inner city and rural areas in America that are not getting the same opportunities to a good education that some other students might be getting.

Now, the CBO today is releasing new figures that say over the next 10 years, the Federal surplus will swell to \$5.6 trillion. Now, on a cautionary note, ladies and gentlemen, 1 month ago their preliminary figure was \$6 trillion, but with the economy slowing down, they have readjusted that by \$400 billion in the last month. If we have an energy crisis, if we have a recession, if we have a problem overseas, that could significantly go down from that \$5.6 trillion initial guesstimate.

We do not know what it is going to be over the next 10 years. But certainly in this town where people are rushing to increase a tax cut, where they are rushing to throw money at defense, the very first thing that we are going to try to do in this session of Congress is work in a bipartisan way on investments in results of better public education. Certainly we can afford to invest some more resources into our education system, for quality teachers, for more public school choice, for professional development opportunities for our teachers, and smaller class sizes, things that are going to make a big difference in the quality of the student graduating from school.

□ 1330

So we will be fighting for more resources, and this bill devotes 35 billion extra dollars on top of current funding over the next 5 years to education for ESEA.

Consolidation, accountability, new resources, and less bureaucracy here. I think this is a very, very strong bill to work with the Bush administration and our fellow Republicans in a bipartisan way to finally get ESEA reauthorized.

There are a couple of areas of disagreement that I think our colleagues will probably talk more about. One of them is how do we address failing schools. If the school is not adequately preparing, if the school is not adequately requiring, if the school is not

adequately making sure that that student is getting good results and learning, then we need to do something about that school.

The Bush administration proposal is to say we are going to give that student a \$1,500 voucher to then leave that public school and take it somewhere else. Well, the first problem is, the \$1,500 voucher could not really get someone in the door of a private school. They still have a \$2,000 or \$3,000 or \$4,000 required payment to make for the tuition. But secondly, it starts to take vital money away from that public school that is failing.

The slogan is, "Leave no Child Behind." Well, one is leaving a school, an entire school, behind with that philosophy. We say in our bill, for a failing school, we are going to demand more. We are going to require more. We are going to remediate that school. We are going to put teachers or principals on probation. We are going to do more to make that school work with empowering parents with public school choice and charter schools and magnet schools and alternative schools, but keep that \$1,500 in the public school system.

We also have differences in some other areas that I will not get into on the amount of testing, on the amount of resources that we devote, but we will probably talk more about these ideas as this bill makes its way through. I think there is a great foundation between our bills to begin working together, with 80 percent agreement and bipartisan reauthorization of ESEA.

I will conclude by again saying that I am very, very proud of the people that have worked so hard to put this new Democratic Coalition bill together and look forward to working in a bipartisan way to see that reauthorization of ESEA is a possible stepping stone to working in a bipartisan way on other issues.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I just want to, before calling on my next colleague, amplify the point that the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) made about where the new Democrats are coming from on this issue. For years, there has been this sort of frozen public debate going on between Republicans and Democrats, with Democrats arguing that more money needs to be spent and Republicans arguing that there needs to be more accountability for results; and that as a consequence we have not done anything. We really have not moved forward significantly in either area.

What this bill represents and what the new Democratic Coalition has worked so hard to do is a way to find a middle ground to bridge the gap and recognize what we ought to do is both. We certainly ought to have a more accountable education system that measures results, that tells us who is succeeding and who is not. We also need to invest resources; and that is going to be a major, major topic of conversation between us and the White House, is

how much money are they willing to put into this to help make sure we do not leave any child behind. If we are talking about ratcheting up the tax cut from a trillion to \$1.6 trillion to \$2 trillion to whatever it winds up as being, think about what we could do with some of those dollars if they were invested in education if we actually made a difference on things like class size and school construction and investing in those poor communities that do not have adequate access.

I think we need to make sure that the White House shows us a commitment on the investment side as well as on the accountability side. We as New Democrats are trying to do both because we recognize that both need to be done.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND), who is also a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce and has been working on these issues for a number of years.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH), for yielding me this time and also securing this hour for general discussion about education policy.

As my friend from Indiana pointed out, there is a convergence of energy and interests and anticipation really in doing something good in this session of Congress in regards to reforming the education system in this country.

I am a proud sponsor, as a member of the new Democratic Coalition, of the RRRs program that the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) has just laid out for us. I think it is a realistic proposal. It is credible, and it is long overdue.

The consolidation aspect is much needed. It will increase flexibility to local school districts so that the decision-makers, those who are intimately involved in reforming the education system, will have an opportunity to implement the reforms that they know will succeed at the local level; but it also recognizes importantly enough that we have to be committed to making a major investment if we are going to see the results that we are demanding now from our school districts and the administrators.

This is a very exciting proposal. It is a very good starting point. Many of the features that we have in this RRR proposal are very similar to what the new administration and President Bush just announced last week. In fact, last Thursday I had the opportunity to go to the White House and sit down and have a good conversation with the President, along with a few other members of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, in regards to the proposals that he released last week. There are a lot of good proposals that President Bush is bringing to the table on education reform, not least of which is his philosophy that there is a Federal role in the education system, in the education of our children.

It was a philosophy that in recent years, at least, we were fighting on the

Committee on Education and the Workforce. Many of our colleagues in this Chamber were actually advocating shutting down the Department of Education, claiming that there was no Federal role at all to help with local school districts and the resources that they need in order to make the improvements that we would like to see. President Bush is saying, no, that is wrong. There is a role. We have a responsibility, and there is a way for us to work together in a bipartisan fashion to assist these local school districts in making these reforms.

There are also some points of contention, issues that we are going to seriously debate and get into as we get into the formulation of education policy, the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act that we have to get accomplished this year in committee; not least of which is the whole idea of accountability, and what people mean by that, because it has various definitions. It has various meanings.

I think what we have with the RRR proposal from the new Democratic Coalition is a requirement that we want to see student performance measured so that we can take corrective action, take remedial action for students who are detected as falling behind, so that they are not left behind as they progress through the education system.

I would hate for us in this Congress, though, to work on a system of accountability which merely establishes a regime of sanctions and penalties, and I am afraid that with the private voucher proposal in the President's plan that we could very easily get to that step where we would be draining precious and limited resources from the public education system that we want to support and put it into the private sphere, where there are, granted, a lot of good private schools doing wonderful things throughout the country. But let us face it, the private school system does not have the same type of system of accountability that the public school systems currently have. Nor would we necessarily want to attach strings and a lot of accountability with the funds that go into private, and especially parochial, education.

I am very concerned about the separation of church-and-state issues if accountability follows the Federal dollars, which is an issue that really has not been aired all that much when one gets into the private voucher plan, and one that we really need to be more careful about in our discussions as we go forward. There are some very attractive features in what the President is calling for, what we are calling for in our education plan, the emphasis on professional development programs so we have the quality teachers in the classroom, which is perhaps the second most important determinant of how well our students are going to perform, right after parental involvement.

I hope we do not lose sight of the necessity of investing in professional de-

velopment of the school leaders, principals, superintendents, the administrators. Everyone who has been involved in the school system realizes how important it is to have quality people in those positions to quarterback the education system and to provide guidance and implement the reforms that are necessary. The President, too, is emphasizing, as President Clinton before him, early childhood literacy programs which, again, received fierce resistance in this House over the last 4 years, the Reading Excellence Act. President Bush is now asking for a ramp up in early childhood literacy programs, and I applaud him for that, but there is one area that hopefully we can embrace and form bipartisan consensus around, and that is for this United States Congress to live up to the Federal responsibility and obligation to fully fund special education costs throughout the country.

Our obligation is roughly 40 percent of the special education costs that school districts have to incur in order to educate these children. These children deserve to be educated. They deserve to get a good education, but it requires an investment because of the special needs that they bring to the classroom. We have only been funding it at roughly 12, 13 percent. If we can get to that 40 percent level, which will require a substantial investment in special education, IDEA is the program's name, that would free up a lot of resources then by its very nature at the local school districts. That would provide them with increased flexibility in order to make reforms that they want to make at the local school districts, and all that it requires is an act of Congress, with the cooperation of the appropriators and the administration, to be committed to this concept of fully funding our obligation to special education needs across the country.

Not only is it the right thing to do, I think it is good policy if we really want to see the results that many of us have a passion for in the public school system. It is an issue that I personally raised with the President as they are beginning to formulate their budget proposal which will be submitted shortly to Congress for our consideration.

Just to close on a point that my friend, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), made, there is a lot of euphoria in Washington these days in regards to the latest CBO projected budget surpluses, \$5.6 trillion, which was announced today; but I think we need to be careful because I think the greatest challenge we are going to face this year in Congress is to lose fiscal discipline. By that I mean if we look at the actual numbers and how they play out, first of all, two-thirds of even that projection does not occur until the second 5 years, which means we cannot front-load a lot of that tax cut which a lot of people want to do because of the slowdown of economic times. We do not have the money to do that.

Secondly, if we take the Social Security Trust Fund and the Medicare Trust Fund out of that equation, and hopefully we are going to have consensus on that this year, that \$5.6 trillion is suddenly reduced to \$2.6 trillion. If we are starting with a premise of a \$2 trillion-plus tax cut, that leaves very little for all the other domestic policy items which will be receiving attention, increasing defense spending, farm relief again because the farmers are suffering, the education investment that many of us would like to see; but also I think we are hopeful and hedging our bets on whether or not the economy is going to continue to perform and produce these surpluses that these tax figures are being based upon right now. So we face some challenges. I think we have a lot of area of common ground and some good common agreement in which to start from.

There are going to be some contentious issues. I think the RRR proposal that we are introducing today is very comparable, in fact, to what a lot of moderate Republicans in Congress have been advocating for some time as well. I feel a political coalition can be formed quite easily, as long as we deal up front with some of the more contentious issues and not allow that to bring down what could be a very good education year here in the United States Congress.

I commend again my friend, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH), for the hard work that he has put in over the last couple of years in being able to put an education proposal of this nature together. There have been a lot of people involved and hopefully good things will emanate from it.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate all of the help from the gentleman, and support and work on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, now I would like to recognize the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY), also a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I stand here very proudly as a cosponsor of the new Democratic Coalition on supporting the RRRs. I sit on the Committee on Education and the Workforce and for the last 4 years we certainly have been trying to bring together new initiatives on how we are going to bring the best education to all of our children, all of our children; and the RRRs program is a program that can work for all of our children across this country.

Politicians are very good a lot of times at saying, well, we are going to do this, we are going to do this, we are going to do this. I really hope this time around that we are going to have an educational policy that is going to be there for our children.

Each and every one of us comes from different districts. We all represent different parts of this country; but when it comes down to education, the American people want us to do something.

The RRRs education program, as far as I am concerned, will answer all of the problems that we are having across this Nation.

I want to just say a little thing on the side. Thank goodness the majority of our schools in this country are doing well. Please let us not forget them. We are talking about dealing with schools that need extra help. I have a school in my district, Roosevelt School District, and they were taken over by the State a couple of years ago and they are struggling. This is why I am such a strong opponent of having a voucher system. If we start losing monies that go into the Roosevelt School system, what are we going to do with all the other kids?

□ 1345

We are going to leave so many children behind. Vouchers sound wonderful. They do sound wonderful. They are not the answer. Federal dollars have to go into our public schools.

A question that I certainly hope that someone will be able to answer for me from the administration is, if it gets passed, and I am hoping that it does not, but if the \$1,500 voucher gets passed, and a child takes that into whatever school they go to, where is the accountability for that \$1,500? How do we know that that child is getting the education that they should be getting? These are some of the questions that we have to answer in the next several months.

The bottom line is, the American people want to have a good education. When we talk about 7 percent of our Federal dollars going into our schools, if we really think about that, it is not very much that goes back to our school systems. But the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) and I agree totally on IDEA. Those are the schools, unfortunately, that are getting hurt the most, because it puts that much money out to these children that learn differently. That is all it is. They learn differently. If the schools could be freed up for the monies that they have to spend to educate these children, then school districts would have more local control on educating those students that are considered "normal."

Let me say something about that. We have such an opportunity in the next few months to do probably one of the best things that we can do for this country and for the future of this country, and that is passing an educational program that is going to go to our neediest children, which our program does; it will go to the neediest children, it will give those school districts the head start that they need. We are building on the future of America. We are not only doing ourselves a favor, we are doing this whole country a favor.

So as we go forward in the months ahead, I think the RRRs educational proposal, which is something that has been out here for a couple of years; this is not new. We have been trying to

push this for a couple of years. Hopefully, we will see our program go through, and then we will be doing the right thing for the American children, and we will be doing the right thing for our country.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman. It is now my pleasure to call on one of our new colleagues, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) who worked in her State on educational issues and now has the opportunity to bring that knowledge to the Federal level.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to be an original cosponsor of this bill, Improving Education Through the RRRs. Increasing the excellence of our children's education must be our national priority.

This approach to funding and focusing on educational reform is a philosophical framework for how to keep our eyes on that goal.

First, it recognizes that a large increase in funding for education is not only critical and possible, but that money must be directed where it is most needed. Title I funds not only deserve the 50-percent increase called for, but also are protected from nonprogram uses. The bill requires accountability of the results of these programs.

Second, there is an emphasis on promoting the recruitment and retention of high-quality teachers and principals. This is fundamental to improving teaching, particularly in California where less than half of the needed new teachers are being trained in our universities. There are many successful programs to recruit new teachers and support them, and they deserve new funding. In California, we have supported a very successful mentoring program for teachers in their first 2 years. Individuals who enter teaching as a second career also need extensive mentoring and training support when they enter the classroom. These are costly programs and need additional funding which is included in this bill.

Retaining the best teachers is also important. As a member of the California legislature, I sponsored substantial one-time awards for teachers who have achieved National Board for Professional Teaching Standards Certification; and, as a result, the number of candidates for this demanding program which demonstrates excellence in the classroom have doubled annually. This is one example of the type of program which would be eligible for funding under this bill. It inspires excellence and rewards the best professionals. Public recognition of professionalism is another way to improve retention of our most valued teachers.

Targeting funding to recruitment of mid-career teachers is also critical. The new Troops to Teachers program can be a model for the much larger Transition to Teaching program called for in this legislation.

Third, as prudent stewards, we must insist on accountability of the programs we fund. California has initiated many of the types of accountability called for under this proposal. As a result, I am keenly aware of the care which must be taken in aligning our testing with State and locally developed curricula and of moving toward testing which evaluates many different types of student performance. I look forward to working on refining these programs so that they also are effective.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this bill establishes the appropriate framework for improving education, and I commend it to my colleagues.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, we are joined by another freshman Member, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), who has also worked on education issues on the State level and now is taking that expertise to the Federal level.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in urging support for the Public Education Reinvestment, Reinvention, and Responsibility Act. This bill invests more in education, \$35 billion over 5 years, for title I, for poor and disadvantaged communities where many young people, through no fault of their own, are getting a poor education, and are failing to meet their full potential because of our failures. It provides more for charter schools, for magnet schools and innovative public school choice programs, and also to help children unlock the door of opportunity that is the English language.

How do we make this investment? Are we simply throwing good money after bad? Are we spending more without doing more? The answer is no. This bill targets children who are most in need. Seven percent of the public school budget is provided via Federal funding. Our solution is, therefore, a 7 percent solution; and it will only be effective if it is targeted and targeted to those who are most in need. This bill does that.

The bill also provides local schools with greater flexibility to use local innovation to meet local needs. It does this by consolidating a myriad of Federal programs into five national goals. I introduced legislation not unlike this in the State legislature in California.

It was very instructive as we proceeded with that bill, consolidating 30 categorical education programs into one. Each of the special interests that had grown up around that particular categorical program came to oppose it. It became very apparent to me, as I think it has to many in this country, that some of the educational programs, albeit started for good reason and with the best of intentions, have come to exist and persist for themselves, not for the benefit of the children they were intended to teach, but to perpetuate the suppliers, the vendors, of those materials of that approach, and this has to end if we are going to

change public education for the better. This proposal consolidates those programs, develops a system based on accountability, not accountability simply that the money is spent for its intended purpose, but rather accountability that says, we will give you flexibility, you give us good results.

Under the current law, there is no accountability. That has to change if we are going to improve the quality of a public school system. We have to demand more of our teachers, of our parents, of ourselves, and this bill goes a long way to doing exactly that.

Why all the focus on education in the last few years? We have a proud heritage in this country of public education. It has always been the great equalizer providing opportunity to the poorest among us, tapping the human potential of every child, and giving them a chance to succeed, a chance to enjoy the American dream. We are losing that heritage to schools that underperform, with children who fail or drop out or perhaps, saddest of all, who graduate and cannot read, who get a diploma and cannot write. Jefferson once said that "A nation that expects to live both ignorant and free expects what never was and never will be." Today's bill does honor to the father of public education, and restores our commitment to public education and civic education.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the work of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH), the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), and others; and I urge the support of my colleagues.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to pick up on one of the points that the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) mentioned about the accountability provisions and how they are currently in the Federal law and what we would like to do to change them to. Ironically, right now, there is no accountability in terms of the Federal money spent. That means that the Federal Government does not periodically do audits of school districts, but when they go in, what they look at is, did you spend the money the way we told you to, and did you fill out the paperwork that proves that. The one thing that those Federal audits do not care about is whether or not the children are succeeding, whether or not the school is working. That is a ridiculous situation, putting process over results.

What we try to do here is we change that. We will give them the flexibility to spend the money to succeed, but we are also going to keep track of whether or not you are succeeding and if you are not, we are going to figure out a way to help all schools succeed. It is much better than the paperwork approach used right now.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to a new Member of Congress, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN).

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address one of the most pressing issues facing the Nation and my district, and that is education. Having just been elected to Congress in November, I have spent many months traveling across the second district of Washington State meeting with parents and teachers and local school officials from Everett to Blaine, from Concrete to Coupeville and up in the San Juan Islands as well, and the message from them is clear: they want local control of education. Again and again I hear that people are greatly concerned about public education. They are concerned about the quality of education and preparing our kids today to compete in the job market of tomorrow. They want accountability. If taxpayers support education, they simply want their money to be spent more wisely.

Today, therefore, I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of the RRRs bill, the Reinvestment, Reinvention, and Responsibility Act of 2001. This bill is a new approach to Federal education policy, one that refocuses our resources and our resolve on raising academic achievement. The RRRs streamlines the more than 50 Federal education programs into five performance-based grants. It increases the Federal investment in education, but better targets those funds. Most importantly, Mr. Speaker, it increases the accountability for results with Federal tax dollars, focusing these monies on our local school district.

The approach of the RRRs plan that we introduced today is simple: invest in reform and insist on results. We want to give States and local school districts the resources that they need to help every student learn at a high level.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, does not promote vouchers, but the targeting of Federal dollars to the communities across this Nation and my district that need them the most. In fact, I believe that vouchers are the wrong answer to the right question: What are we going to do to improve our public schools? The RRRs bill, in my opinion, is a key step in improving our public schools.

In the new economy, it is a time to take an approach to education in a new way, so I join with my fellow Democrats and colleagues in supporting the RRRs legislation; and I look forward to working in a bipartisan fashion here on the floor of the House with Republicans and with the administration in passing the RRRs here in Congress.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, that concludes our presentation. I am going to conclude with a few remarks of my own, but I want to thank my colleagues who joined me here today to introduce our proposal on Federal education policy, the RRRs proposal that was introduced today as a bill. I particularly want to thank the new Democrats and the work that they have done to forge this middle ground on education, to stop the either/or partisan rhetoric that has been going on

and focus on something that will really work and will give us the results that we want.

We have a great challenge over the course of the next few months. Our President has made education his top priority and that gives us a tremendous opportunity to make some long-needed changes in Federal education policy. But the devil is always in the details and the difficulty is not in talking about it, but in getting it done. So I hope that we will work hard to make sure that we get there and do what we need to do on education.

We need to make an investment, but in order to make that investment, we need to show the taxpayers that they are going to get results for their dollars. That is sort of the battle I think that has been going on in this country, and a lot of skepticism about the ability of government to get anything done. There are those who believe that government should just sort of get out of the way of everything, and we are not going to change their minds. However, I think there is a larger group of people out there who recognize that particularly in an area like education, government can have a real positive impact on improving the quality of our lives in this country.

□ 1400

These taxpayers just want their money's worth. They do not want us to simply say we are going to throw more money at the problem. They want to know that they are going to be accountable for results that comes with that money. If we can push the three Rs bill that focuses on local control, flexibility and results, I think we can get the public support we need to spend the dollars we need, but that is going to be a real challenge.

It is a challenge as new Democrats that we put down for the President to work with us, certainly to get the accountability and the results-oriented focus. But once we have done that, make the investment that is necessary to get it done, I mean, I wish we could improve the quality of education without spending any more money on it, that would make all of our lives more easy. We would not have to find the dollars and make the more choices when you look at the crushing needs out there, particularly in impoverished communities, rural communities, some urban communities, areas that do not have the dollars to get the basics of what they need, you know that they need help in the resources department.

They need some money from the Federal Government to help meet the needs of their children. And if the philosophy is leave no child behind, you better be prepared to step up to that commitment.

We will give them the accountability and the results, but let us make sure that we go out there and make the investments necessary to educate our population to the degree that they deserve.

I am joined by the person who has done more work on this than anybody, the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY), the gentleman and I actually introduced this bill last session of Congress. It did not go anywhere then, but it is moving now.

There is some change here and I think we have a real opportunity to move forward on that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY) to conclude our discussion today.

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) for yielding to me, and I am just delighted to be here in support of our three Rs proposal.

As Democrats, we recognize that we have to make reforms in the way that the Federal Government is participating as a partner with our local school districts, and what we are doing with this proposal is understanding that it is incumbent upon us to invest more in our public schools and investing those dollars in a way which we are sure are going to benefit those students that are facing the greatest challenges.

I represent a district in the central valley of California. It is one of the lowest income districts in the State. There is a lot of farm worker families that are struggling to make ends meet.

Our school districts are struggling financially, and what this proposal will ensure is that those children of farm workers are not going to be left behind, that the Federal Government is going to be there in order to provide them with the resources that those schools need to ensure that they are going to have the opportunity to excel academically.

But basically as a covenant that we are creating here with our local school districts, by providing these additional dollars, we are going to be demanding more. We are going to be demanding that those schools be held accountable for improving the academic performance of these students. We are going to require that we see improvement on an annual basis of these children and their performance in their classes.

We also are convinced that while we are providing these additional resources, we are providing for greater accountability that we have to have confidence in our local school districts, to do what they think is best in order to provide for this quality academic environment. Thus, we are giving those school districts greater flexibility.

We have consolidated over 45 programs down into five revenue streams, giving those school districts the ability to develop those programs that are going to meet some of their unique challenges. So in return for that investment of additional dollars, in return for giving those school districts greater flexibility, we are going to demand the greater accountability, because we believe, as President Bush does, that we cannot leave any child behind.

We disagree with President Bush on a number of his proposals, but where

there is a lot of in common, there are some significant differences is that with our proposal, when we have a school that is not meeting the academic performance that we believe is appropriate, is that we provide them with additional resources, both in personnel and dollars initially to help see improvement there. But if they continue to fail, we then provide for the option of those school children to go into other public schools.

We provide for public school choice. We also allow that school district to convert that school to a charter school so they can try different and more innovative approaches to improving the academic environment there.

President Bush takes a little bit different approach, and basically he would abandon those schools after 3 years and give that child a \$1,500 voucher that could be used at another public school or a private school. Many of us think that is a false promise, because a \$1,500 voucher to a farm worker child in my district that does not have a private school option, or the private school option they have is much more expensive than that, it is really a false promise.

We are hopeful as we move forward here with this debate on education that we can narrow or find the common ground that is between President Bush's proposal and what we are offering today, because we think, we are not that far apart, with the exception of the utilization and embracement of vouchers by President Bush. Our 3 R's proposal is one which I am convinced will provide the flexibility and resources that our local schools need, will ensure that our children will have a higher quality education, and will ensure that those children that are in some of the most struggling economic areas of our country will have the resources that they need to ensure that they will have the academic opportunities that are going to be so important in terms of their future success.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH), I really appreciate all the work the gentleman has done there and all the cosponsors of this legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY), who is the prime sponsor actually of the 3 R's proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank all of my colleagues once again for their broad support. I think we have the opportunity in the next several months to make some very positive changes in Federal education policy, and I think this bill is an excellent place to start.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working on that with all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

A FIRST-HAND LOOK AT AFRICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KIRK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is

recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I take this time today to report on my recent eight-day, six-country trip to Africa where I visited the Congo, Rwanda, Burundi, Uganda, Sudan and Kenya. I left Washington on January 6 and returned January 14.

I have closely followed events in Africa since being elected to Congress. My first trip to the continent was in 1984 when I went to Ethiopia to witness the heartbreaking famine which resulted in the death of hundreds of thousands of women and children.

Mr. Speaker, I also have been to Algeria, Benin, Egypt, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Sierra Leone and Somalia.

Let me begin by saying that there is far too much suffering going on in Africa. Pain and suffering are a constant. Too many children are dying of starvation, disease, war, and AIDS.

70 percent of the world's AIDS cases are in Africa, where more than 16,000 people a day are infected by the virus. More than 2 million Africans died of AIDS in the year 2000.

The raging civil wars in both the Congo and Sudan are taking a tremendous toll on human life. More than 4 million, more than 4 million combined have died as a result of the two wars in the Congo and Sudan and millions have been displaced.

My trip started in Kinshasa, the capitol of Congo. I visited Congo to help better understand the cause of a raging Civil War that has resulted in more than 1.7 million deaths since 1988, according to the International Rescue Committee, and to explore what, if any, role the United States may be able to play in bringing an end to the conflict.

Mr. Speaker, I was there less than a week before Congolese President Laurent Kabila was assassinated. We met with him on January 8 in the Presidential palace. From Kinshasa, I traveled by plane 1,000 miles to what is called the Great Lakes Region in eastern Congo and spent a day in the town of Goma and a day in the town of Bukavu.

I met with the rebel leadership, women's groups, clergy, average Congolese citizens and representatives of a number of nongovernmental organizations.

I also met with the American missionaries. And I might say. Few of the people that we spoke with support the rebel leadership in this part of the Congo.

Life is not easy for the average Congolese. There are few schools or hospitals and little potable water. Children go hungry. Women live in fear. I heard horrific stories and tales of rape and abuse by different armed forces and soldiers who come into one village, take the food, rape the women, do different things. Three days later a different group comes in. So life for the average person, particularly women and children, is very, very grim.

Soldiers are everywhere; most are young boys or men carrying automatic weapons.

I visited Rwanda to learn more about the reconciliation process the country is going through following a genocide of more than 800,000 ethnic Tutsis in 1994. My trip to Burundi followed for similar reasons.

From 1993 to the year 2000, violence between Hutu and Tutsi ethnic factions in Burundi has left more than 250,000 people dead and created hundreds of thousands refugees. In Rwanda, the first place we visited was Murambi Technical School, which is now a genocide site.

The world seems to forget, but over the course of 100 days, in the spring of 1994, more than 800,000 Tutsis and moderate Hutus were systematically murdered in Rwanda as part of ethnic genocide. Some 50,000 people were slaughtered in the villages near the Murambi Technical School that we visited.

Contorted skeletons now rest on wooden tables in 18 of the school's classrooms. Some are missing limbs. Others have arms over their heads, as if trying to protect themselves from their killers.

One room was filled with just skulls, and they were hacked to death with machetes and most skulls are fragmented from being smashed.

In Kigali, the capitol of Rwanda, I met with President Paul Kagame, members of the Parliament and NGOs. Rwanda needs to pull its troops out of the Congo as do the other countries that have troops in Congo.

Having said that, I do understand the security concerns that the Rwandans have, particularly with what took place with regards to the genocide, but some now appear to have other motives.

They have fought, at least the Rwandans and the Ugandans, have fought at least three times over diamonds and other minerals near the town of Kisangani. And Kisangani is far from the border where they are threatened by EXFAR and Interahamwe.

I next visited Burundi primarily to speak at a prayer breakfast attended by Hutus and Tutsis. Like Rwanda, Burundi has experienced ethnic violence between the Hutus and Tutsis, and more than 250,000 people have been killed over the last decade.

I also met with President Pierre Buyoya and members of the Parliament and, frankly, was very impressed with the efforts of reconciliation taking place both in Rwanda and also in Burundi.

The last leg of my trip took us to Sudan, my fourth visit there in 11 years. Over the past two decades, a Civil War pitting the Khartoum government against the black Christians and others in the southern half of the country has cost more than 2 million lives in war and famine-related deaths, and millions more have been displaced.

So in the last 17 years, over 2 million people, most black Christians and animists have died as a result of the Khartoum government in the North

and with irreverence against those in the South. Regrettably, the situation in Sudan is no better today than in 1989, the first time I traveled to the war-torn region.

The Khartoum regime continues to persecute members of different religious minorities, Christians, Muslim and animist, under the auspices of what they call the Sharia law.

Since 1983, the government of Sudan has been waging a brutal war against factions in the South who are fighting for self determination and religious freedom. The Committee on Conscience of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum has issued a genocide warning for Sudan. It is important for the people in the West to know if the Holocaust Museum believes it is that significant, then those of us in Congress and in the administration should also take note of the genocide warning issued with regard to Sudan.

Earlier, Mr. Speaker, today in the House, during the debate on the resolution on the day of remembrance for the victims of the Holocaust, we took time to speak out to remind the people of genocide that took place less than six decades ago. We need to remember. We need to speak out. Our voices should be raised today about the genocide taking place in Sudan.

Mr. Speaker, I visited the southern town of Yei where the Khartoum government last November committed one of the most heinous acts of violence in the war, bombing a busy marketplace in the middle of the afternoon. Nineteen people were killed. Fifty-two were injured, 14 bombs were rolled out of the back of a Soviet-made Antonov bomber on November 20, the year 2000. No one was spared, women, children, young and old.

I also saw a video that was given to me by an NGO when we were there taken of the bombing. The marketplace was packed. People had nowhere to hide. Some of those killed had their limbs blown off. Women and children were screaming as they witnessed the carnage. The photograph here shows one of the victims, one of the 19 victims of the bombing.

Now, this is a civilian village. It is not a military target, and yet the Khartoum government of Sudan sends bombers over to bomb innocent women and children in the villages.

□ 1415

Now, if you look at the definition of genocide that is recognized, clearly what is taking place in the Holocaust Museum is accurate: genocide in Southern Sudan, and here is an example. Yei is hundreds of miles from the front lines. It is not a military target, but on a daily basis a high-altitude Antonov bomber passes over the town. People are terrified by the bombing runs. You can see it in their eyes. You can hear it in their voices. Ask anyone what concerns them most and the refrain is "the Antonov bomber."

No one knows where the bombs are being dropped because the plane is

sometimes beyond eyesight. Sometimes the planes fly overhead to play mind games with the residents of the town. Sometimes bombs randomly fall from the sky. They have hit churches, homes, hospitals, and sometimes the bombs are 55-gallon oil drums packed with dynamite and nails. The planes fly morning, noon, and night. An Antonov bomber flew over the town on January 13, the last morning I was in Yei. Panic set in. Psychological warfare is taking its toll. People are afraid to build houses or raise crops when they could be destroyed. Peddlers have dug foxholes in the marketplace so they can climb into the hole if a plane flies over, and they pray that the bombs fall somewhere else. We also saw a bomb shelter outside the hospital; people from the hospital went into the bomb shelter and then it was hit and people died. The bombing runs have become a major obstacle to daily life in Yei and throughout Southern Sudan.

Last year nearly 100 innocent Sudanese were killed in bombings according to figures compiled by several NGOs in Southern Sudan. Bombs hit relief agency compounds and convoys, and getting food and supplies through Southern Sudan is difficult enough because of the deplorable conditions of the roads. It took us nearly 4 hours to travel from the border of Uganda to Yei. The actions of the Khartoum Government cannot and should not be tolerated any longer. It is a brutal, repressive regime. Government-sponsored militias torch houses and food supplies, and rape and murder with impunity. Civilian food production and supply lines are attacked, livestock is destroyed, and international relief is obstructed. In 1998 this strategy caused a famine in Southern Sudan that endangered millions and killed tens of thousands.

Then there is the slavery issue. There is slavery in Sudan that we now know for a fact. Slave traders from the north sweep down in the villages and kidnap women and children and sell them for domestic servants or concubines. This is real-life chattel slavery in the 21st century in January and February of this year.

There is also the issue of oil. In 1999 the Khartoum Government began earning hundreds of millions of dollars from oil exports. The hard currency that they are earning from these oil exports are now enabling them to buy new weapons. They are buying Soviet Hind helicopters, and they are killing people. So as they take the money, the oil from the revenue, which has now been listed on the stock exchange, the more money they get, the more helicopters they buy, the more weapons they buy, the more tanks they buy, the more people they kill. So the death rate will be increasing in Khartoum as the oil revenues increase for the Khartoum Government because they are using the hard currency to finance the weapons in the war to kill women and children.

The Khartoum Government has doubled its spending on arms since it

began exporting oil; and as I said, more people are going to die with the additional weapons that are being purchased.

From my observations on this trip, we have several recommendations for the new administration. On the general issue of Africa, I would recommend that the new Bush administration move quickly to show an interest in Africa. A Presidential task force could be created to study Africa which could be made up of experts both in and out of government who have an expertise and interest and a sense of caring with regard to what is taking place in Africa, particularly with regard to women and children.

The panel should make a top-to-bottom review of what policy the United States should take toward Africa, particularly sub-Saharan Africa. It should be charged with offering practical and strategic insight into the promotion of democracy, the prevention and spread of AIDS. Everywhere we went, the issue of AIDS came up over and over; in dealing with other diseases and economic development and trade and education and human rights and religious freedom and other aspects of improving life such as eliminating hunger for the average person in Africa. The panel should submit a country-by-country analysis as well as a regional analysis about the problems and challenges on what the United States should be doing with regard to Africa. There are many people in our government in the State Department and other agencies who have deep personal knowledge of Africa, and if they could be joined by some in academia and others to do this on a fast-track basis so we now know what the policy should be, how we deal country by country and region by region and problem by problem.

Debt relief also must be addressed. Today I introduced the Responsible Debt Relief and Democracy Reform Act, legislation that will provide incentives to countries to institute democratic reforms and basic structures of civil society in order to receive debt relief. The problem is that it is the poorest people in the world and the poorest countries who suffer as a result of the government debt.

Now, this has to be done in a way that as we forgive debt, they, an individual country, does things like bring about democracy, transparency, freedom of the press, freedom of movement; and this has to be done in a way that does not line the pockets of the dictators and the corrupt.

Regarding the area of central Africa with the assassination of Congolese President Kabila on January 16, the situation in Central Africa is more complicated than ever. Kabila's son, Joseph, has been tapped the successor; but it is unclear how all of the Congo's rivals will react. Nevertheless, the United States needs to send a clear and early signal that it cares about the fate of Congo because I think we may have ignored it too long. And when you lis-

ten to what the new president, Joseph Kabila, says, he appears to be open and here is the opportunity. I said earlier that 1.7 million people in the Congo have died. There are millions more who are in the bush in a third of the Congo that cannot even be reached who may be dying on a daily basis and no food, and so there are many more that we cannot even get into the region to find out how bad life is for them.

I also recommend that all foreign armies be publicly pressured to leave the Congo. In addition, something must be done to disarm and demobilize and resettle the former Rwandan Army and militia forces and the rebel factions warring in the Congo. When we ask the Rwandan Government to pull its soldiers out, we also have to have some mechanism whereby the Rwandans are comfortable that their border will be protected and those who did the mass genocide cannot come back in and do those things again. There are ways of doing it with balance.

The United Nations should put together an assessment team to develop a strategy for withdrawal. The United States must forcefully speak out and act creatively on this issue. Our failure to speak out during the genocide in Rwanda in 1994 was wrong. The failure of the United States and the failure of the West not to speak out on the issue of genocide in 1994 was wrong and will go down as a dark day as historians look back on that period. We should not now remain silent on the issue of foreign troops because nearly 2 million people have already died in the Congo over the last few years and that number should not be allowed to continue to multiply.

Regarding Sudan, I believe there should be a major effort on the part of the United States, the United Nations and the European Union to bring an end to the war in Sudan and peace with justice. Peace with justice has to be a priority of the Bush administration. Sudan is a litmus test; and as history looks back for those who care about human rights, about civil rights, and about religious persecution and about hunger, it should be viewed in terms of this decade's South Africa. The same amount of time and energy and resources should be put into ending the war in Sudan that was put into bringing democracy and freedom to South Africa.

I recommend that a full-time high-profile envoy be appointed by President Bush to help bring peace to Sudan. This must be a person of national stature such as former Secretary of State Jim Baker or former U.N. Ambassador Richard Holbrooke.

When President Clinton appointed former Senator Mitchell of Maine to be the special envoy for Ireland, everyone knew that Mitchell had President Clinton's ear. Any time Mitchell wanted Clinton to make a telephone call, he was able to get it done; and former Senator Mitchell should be commended for the outstanding job he did in bringing peace to Northern Ireland.

When Tony Lake was working on the Ethiopian-Eritrean war, he was the special envoy, and when he needed something done, he was able to get President Clinton to do it. The envoy must be someone that the President and the Secretary of State have confidence in and has a real interest in seeing the conflict in Sudan resolved. The envoy also must have the President's ear. Clearly the envoy concept with somebody like Senator Mitchell worked in Ireland and I believe can work and will work in Sudan.

Not to try it would be in essence sentencing the women and children in the south and the villages to continual death. One young man I spoke to said, I was born in this war and I am afraid I will die in this war. This is an opportunity for the new administration to really bring about peace and demonstrate that we can make a big, big difference. I also recommend that our allies in the region be pressured, be urged to be encouraged to become more engaged.

Egypt. Egypt, for example, has tremendous influence over the Khartoum regime. The United States Government, the American taxpayer, everyone out there, should know that we have given over \$45 billion in foreign aid to Egypt since the Camp David Accords were signed in 1978. Over \$45 billion. We should use this leverage. Egypt should not be sitting by on the sidelines when this war is raging in Sudan where there are over 2.2 million people killed, where there is slavery, where there is terrorism problems. Many terrorist groups who operate in the Middle East have training camps and operate around Khartoum.

Where the problem of hunger is growing, Egypt and other friendly countries like that who are friends of the United States should be urged to be engaged and be involved to help bring about the peace, as should our allies in Europe.

□ 1430

I also believe it is important for the United States to support systems of local governance and sustenance in southern Sudan. Operation Lifeline of Sudan, which has cost billions, is subject to the control of the government of Sudan and it is manipulated by the Khartoum government to suit its objectives. The government claims that its territorial integrity is violated by foreign NGOs in the south trying to help the people it claims as citizens. And until the fighting actually ends and there is peace, the United States should strongly support the Sudanese People's Liberation Movement.

In conclusion, from what I saw on the trip, I believe the Bush administration and the Congress, working together, have a unique opportunity to make a real difference in Africa and in Sudan, and now is the time to seize it.

I was pleased to learn that the African bureau was the first section area our new Secretary of State Colin Powell visited at the State Department.

That is a small step, but it was an extremely positive one. I am also pleased that Secretary Powell addressed Africa during his confirmation hearings.

Africa and the world is watching. We can provide hope and opportunity to these people who have suffered so much, particularly in southern Sudan and in central Africa. The figures are hard to comprehend, but more than 4 million people, more than 4 million, a population larger than some of our largest cities, have died in Sudan and in the Congo. Four million. The number is staggering and the number is increasing. With more weapons being purchased, it is increasing more. With more child soldiers running rampant through the Congo and Sudan it is increasing more.

We cannot, we in the Congress and those in the Bush administration, cannot allow the suffering to continue without trying, without making an effort. The Bush administration has a unique opportunity to make a difference in Africa.

Throughout my trip, the constant refrain I heard was that the United States just needed to show that it cared. No one, no one asked for American troops to be deployed. No one needs, supports, believes that American soldiers have to be involved in any way. They just want America to use its efforts, and they want America to send a signal that it will begin to focus on the plight of Africa before another generation of young people is lost to civil war, famine, disease, and AIDS.

America has a rich history of reaching out to bring peace and stability and reconciliation to communities around the world. We have made a difference in northern Ireland, we have made a difference in Eastern Europe, we have made a difference in so many places. We are attempting to bring peace to the Middle East. It is now time to focus on Africa, to focus on the Congo and to focus on the Sudan to end the killing.

IN OPPOSITION TO CONFIRMATION OF SENATOR ASHCROFT FOR ATTORNEY GENERAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KIRK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it gives me, I want to say great pleasure; but I do not know if it is great pleasure that I have as I stand here this afternoon. I stand here and hope to be joined by a number of my colleagues in opposition to the confirmation of Senator John Ashcroft for Attorney General. This special order today will be dedicated to opposing that confirmation.

In the wake of the election calamity in Florida, we find ourselves forced into yet another battle to defend the tenets of our Constitution, equal protection and fairness for all. This unfortunate situation arises only a few

weeks after the President-elect promised to be a uniter, not a divider; to be the President of all Americans, not just the minority who voted for him. Sadly, the nomination of John Ashcroft to be this Nation's Attorney General makes those words ring hollow.

If President Bush truly wishes to unite this country, his selection of John Ashcroft is a puzzling one. If, on the other hand, his goal is to appease a small minority of Americans who view the principles of equal protection and fairness for all Americans with disdain, he could find no better candidate for Attorney General than John Ashcroft.

The Ashcroft nomination does nothing to move this country towards much-needed healing. In fact, Senator Ashcroft has openly rejected those members of his own party who speak of conciliation and compromise and has fanatically urged the encroachment of conservatism. Senator Ashcroft's public record exhibits an open hostility to the very laws and policies that protect the civil rights of all individuals in our society. More importantly, Senator Ashcroft has revealed a troubling lack of integrity in his attempts to use the power entrusted to him by Missouri voters to force his personal agenda into public policy and law by whatever means necessary, including personal attacks and distortions of truth.

Sadly, he has extended his proclivity for mischaracterization into his Senate confirmation hearings, where he blatantly distorted his own record and history in hopes of convincing this Senate that the partisan zealot we have come to know has become a rational, fair, public servant. We should not be fooled.

There are a number of reasons to oppose Senator Ashcroft, but his appalling record on civil rights alone makes him unqualified for this job. No one would entrust their home to a caretaker who has made repeated attempts to burn it to the ground. Similarly, it makes no sense to place our civil rights laws in the hands of a man who has shown an outright hostility to the very notion of civil rights for all.

For example, Senator Ashcroft voted against the Hate Crimes Prevention Act and opposes any form of affirmative action. He eagerly accepted an honorary degree from Bob Jones University, vigorously opposed the gathering of racial profiling statistics, and aggressively fought school desegregation ordered by the Federal courts in Missouri. Senator Ashcroft also praised Southern Partisan Magazine, which has been called neosegregationist, and called Confederate soldiers patriots.

Many of Senator Ashcroft's supporters, in an attempt to sweep this abysmal record under the rug, insist that he should be judged not on his veracity and record but solely on his character. However, even if we were to disregard this other extensive evidence of his unfitness and limit our decision to his character, he badly fails the test

as well. For example, in the Senate Committee on the Judiciary earlier this month, Mr. Ashcroft repeatedly and blatantly misrepresented or evaded the facts of his own record. He wants this job so badly that he is willing to misstate the truth in order to obtain it.

Senator Ashcroft's willingness to jettison honesty and integrity to achieve his political ends is nothing new. As a member of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, he was well known for viciously attacking candidates whose political views did not agree with his extremist ideas. He opposed the confirmation of two highly qualified attorneys, Marsha Berzon and Richard Paez to the Federal Courts of Appeals. The most recent offense was his dishonest and cynical campaign against a Federal judicial nomination of a highly qualified African-American Supreme Court Judge, Ronnie White. He demonstrated a disturbing lack of integrity by distorting the truth and misleading the press and his colleagues in the Senate in order to sabotage White's nomination to a Federal District Court.

His history and past behavior of twisting facts and law to conform to his own narrow political views further reveals his unfitness to serve as this country's top law enforcement official. My legal experience as a judge and prosecutor taught me that the law is often not clearly defined and in such cases must be interpreted by the person enforcing it. That is why I am so concerned about Senator Ashcroft's nomination. He said over and over again, in the Senate confirmation hearings, that he would be willing to enforce the law when the law was clear and convincing. What I am worried about is what happens when the law is not clear and convincing.

As the Attorney General, Senator Ashcroft would be vested with significant discretion, having oversight over U.S. attorneys throughout these United States. And throughout these United States, they are required to follow the policy of the Attorney General. Let me just give an example. When Janet Reno served as Attorney General, one of the programs she had in place was Trigger Lock. The purpose of Trigger Lock was to enforce certain penalties against those who carried guns. This was a policy that passed throughout the United States.

What I worry about is, should Senator Ashcroft become the Attorney General, what policies he will put in place that will pass throughout the country. What policies will he put in place that might inhibit someone because of their sexual preference; that might inhibit someone because of their religion; that might inhibit someone because of their race; that might inhibit someone as a result of their choice to speak on a particular issue.

Now, when the law is clear, perhaps he will follow the law because he knows a billion people will be watching him. But all prosecutors, all attorneys

general are permitted to make decisions that will never see the light of day, and those decisions are the ones we are concerned about, where he is vested with discretion, based on his past experience and his past service as not only a governor, as an Attorney General, but also as a Senator. That is why we are worried. Based on his extensive record, I have no confidence that Mr. Ashcroft is capable of interpreting our Nation's laws in a way that furthers the best interests of the American people rather than his own ideology.

The Attorney General must have the trust of the American people. Clearly, he does not. Recently, an unprecedented nationwide campaign of coalitions, representing over 200 national organizations, launched the Stop Ashcroft Crusade. Not surprisingly, many of Mr. Ashcroft's supporters have attempted to vilify this coalition by incorrectly characterizing it as an assembly of marginal left-leaning interest groups. However, this coalition represents a broad base of American citizens and wide-ranging mainstream issues, including civil and human rights, the environment, women's rights and choice, gun control, workplace concerns and religious freedom, and cannot be dismissed so cavalierly.

□ 1445

The depth and breadth of opposition to Mr. Ashcroft is best exemplified by those who know him best, his own constituency in his home State of Missouri, who overwhelmingly voted for a deceased candidate rather than endure another 6 years with him as senator.

The grim truth is that the record of Senator Ashcroft is not only anti-ethical to the necessary virtues of an effective U.S. Attorney General, it also demonstrates values and belief in direct conflict with the purported philosophy of President Bush.

Mr. Ashcroft is a divider, not a uniter, and by President Bush's own definition, is unqualified to serve as this Nation's Attorney General. For this reason, I pray that my colleagues in the Senate will show a commitment to true bipartisanship and show a commitment to the people of these United States and politely and firmly show Mr. Ashcroft the door.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KIRK). If the gentlewoman will suspend, the Chair would gently remind all Members not to characterize or advise the other body on their decision, under the tradition of comity.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Would the Speaker repeat that for me, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would urge all Members not to advise the other body as to how they should vote under the rule seeking to establish comity and continued cooperation with the other body.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to my colleague the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me and I want to thank her for her leadership in bringing this special order to the floor on this special day when Mr. Ashcroft is indeed before the Senate and in the nomination that the President has put.

I want to speak to the standard that should be used in deciding whether a nominee for Attorney General should be approved. I think it is only fair to use the same standard that Mr. Ashcroft used, because I believe if we use that standard, then it would be necessary to follow him in voting against a presidential choice.

This is what Mr. Ashcroft himself said. I am quoting from the transcript of proceedings in the nomination of Bill Lan Lee for Assistant Attorney General of the United States, and here is what Mr. Ashcroft himself said: "He has, obviously, the incredibly strong capacities to be an advocate, but I think his pursuit of specific objectives that are important to him limit his capacity to have the balanced view of making the judgments that will be necessary for the person who runs that division."

If this is the standard, Mr. Speaker, if the standard set by Mr. Ashcroft is to be followed, incredibly strong capacities to be an advocate, this is the man with the strongest capacity to be an advocate on the issues he espouses, the issues that are at issue in the United States Senate, then you need somebody, he says, with a more balanced view. Or again, reading from Mr. Ashcroft's own words again in the Bill Lan Lee proceedings: "I don't think that this is an issue that really is an issue about the appointments of the President. I think this is an issue about the job that should be filled."

So Mr. Ashcroft wants us to look at the job that should be filled. So I want to look at the job that should be filled. The job that would be filled is Attorney General of the United States. To fill that job, one has, it seems to me, to meet not only substantive standards such as qualifications, but the appearance to be able to do fairness. After all, they are the chief prosecutor and they have got to somehow create the appearance that, in choosing who to prosecute, in choosing what to pursue, they have done so on a fair basis.

In other words, all of the talk about Mr. Ashcroft's qualifications as a lawyer I concede. Because being Attorney General of the United States is not only about whether they can do it, but whether they give the apparent appearance of fairness in doing it.

Or, as Mr. Ashcroft said, this is an issue about the job to be filled. The job to be filled here is not simply just the kind of job that my students at Georgetown University Law School, when they go to a law firm, have to fill. That is how they qualify to go to a job when they are among the best and brightest students, as they are, in the country. To be Attorney General of

the United States, there is another very important ingredient, and that is, can they be fair in doing it and have they led their life so that people will believe that they are being fair in doing it.

I believe it is not appropriate to oppose a nominee because one disagrees with him. If that were the case, then I would have to oppose any senator probably in the United States Senate who was up for Attorney General.

The reason that I think it fair to oppose Mr. Ashcroft is that he is on the fringes of advocacy on issues that are central to his jurisdiction as Attorney General of the United States, he is on the fringes of advocacy of civil rights, he is on the fringes of advocacy of the rights of gays, he is on the fringes of advocacy of the rights of women to reproductive freedom.

It is not that we oppose him. It is that he has set himself so far on the edge of advocacy that he has created doubts and serious doubts about his ability to fill the position for which he has been nominated, and that is the standard he has set and that is the standard that the Senate itself says should be set.

It is that standard that Mr. Ashcroft has not met. He has not met that standard when it came to the way he opposed a voluntary plan for integration in a State that had a long history of segregation. He has not followed that standard when it came to the way he opposed reproductive freedom for women, going well beyond the standard that we use even in this House when wanting to bar, outlaw the procedure altogether under any and all circumstances.

What woman can be for that? Well, I tell you this much. Most women in the United States oppose that. He has not met that standard when it comes to his fairness in judging the qualifications of others, such as Judge Ronnie White.

Having not met that standard, the standard he himself set, I do not see how others should be called upon to hold him to a lesser standard. I think this is an issue about the job, as Senator Ashcroft said when judging whether Bill Lan Lee should become Assistant Attorney General for civil rights. I think this is about the job even more so because this is about the job of Attorney General of the United States.

On that score, I can say, having looked to the standard he set, the standard that I believe is being used in the Senate of the United States as I speak, that John Ashcroft does not meet the qualifications to be Attorney General of the United States.

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 5 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY).

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus today to voice my deep concerns regarding the nomination of

John Ashcroft for Attorney General of the United States.

I want to also commend my colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) for her leadership with the CBC Task Force on this nomination and for scheduling this special order.

Mr. Speaker, our Constitution states that the President has the right to nominate individuals whom he chooses to be in his cabinet. Likewise, the Senate has the right and duty to advise and consent on those nominations as it sees fit.

But I am a congressman from Missouri, a place known as the "show me" State, and I am not easily convinced. I will wait to see which John Ashcroft shows up as Attorney General, the John Ashcroft who appeared at the confirmation hearing, or the one who I served with in Missouri State government. Because those are two very different men.

Evidently, former Senator Ashcroft has had a sudden epiphany, one which miraculously coincided with his confirmation hearing. He has apparently undergone a great conversion on a wide range of issues that he has consistently opposed in the past, issues such as civil rights, school desegregation, voting rights, reproductive choice, and equal protection for all Americans, including those of a different sexual orientation.

But the John Ashcroft that I served with when he was Missouri attorney general and governor was not at the confirmation hearing we witnessed.

I know what John Ashcroft's real record as a public servant has been because I was there. His public record shows a pattern of extremism that has deprived many children of a quality education. He squandered millions of tax dollars and harmed our State by using racially divisive political tactics.

But for now, I will take Senator Ashcroft at his word that as U.S. Attorney General, he will enforce all Federal laws vigorously, regardless of his personal views and past record.

I hope that both President Bush and former Senator Ashcroft are sincere in their intent to use the law as a healing force in this country. And to demonstrate that sincerity, I challenge the President and Senator Ashcroft to put their words into action by renominating Justice Ronnie White to the Federal bench.

Americans are still divided following a bitter election, and this current nomination process has deepened the divisions across our country. Renominating Justice White would provide a powerful act of healing. It would show the American people that the new administration is serious about bringing our Nation together.

I urge the President to take advantage of this unique opportunity and demonstrate the compassion he so frequently refers to. And I hope that former Senator Ashcroft will encourage him to do so.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) for her leadership in her efforts to inform the public with regards to the facts as to why so many of us are opposed to the appointment of Senator John Ashcroft as Attorney General of the United States.

The Attorney General heads this Nation's Department of Justice. Extremist views, which Mr. Ashcroft has demonstrated over and over again, will not serve the cause of justice.

It has been said that extremism in defense of liberties is no vice. Well, what about extremism which comes at the expense of liberty?

I believe that the appointment of Mr. Ashcroft really does threaten the liberty of women across this country to make fundamental decisions about their health and their reproductive lives. For at least three times, for example, he stood on the floor of the Senate to vote against a woman's right to choose, even in the case of rape, incest, or even major injury to the woman.

This is, after all, a man who not only opposes abortion, he has supported legislation that would outlaw many forms of birth control.

□ 1500

We cannot go back to the days when government controlled such essential personal decisions.

We cannot have an Attorney General who so strongly opposes the law of the land which upholds a woman's right to choose. I believe that the appointment of Mr. Ashcroft threatens the liberty of minorities across this country.

In his quest for reelection, Mr. Ashcroft besmirched the reputation of a respected African American judge in order to win political points. He has pointed to the old confederacy for his heroes. We cannot go back to those days, either.

I believe that the appointment of Mr. Ashcroft endangers the rights of Americans who face discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. He opposed and sought to block the appointment of Ambassador Hormel, an openly gay and highly qualified nominee, while refusing to even meet with him. He has not only openly opposed gay rights in employment, he has reportedly trampled them himself in his own interviewing tactics. Once again, we cannot go back there. We have come too far.

President Bush has promised us bipartisan cooperation. Yet he has nominated as our Nation's chief law enforcement officer a man who publicly denounced members of his own party who champion conciliation or counsel compromise. This is a man who has really built a career on extremism, not on justice. As such, I urge my colleagues in the Senate to stand up in defense of all of our liberties and defeat Mr. Ashcroft, who will not do justice for many as the head of our Department of Justice.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KIRK). The gentlewoman will suspend.

The Chair will remind the Member that although Members may air their views concerning nominees for Cabinet posts, it is not in order to urge action on the part of the Senate or to characterize Senate action, in order to preserve comity between the two bodies.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my concern today about the nomination of Senator John Ashcroft and want to express my appreciation to the leadership of the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) to give us this opportunity to simply express our concerns.

Let me say at the outset that, on paper, Mr. Ashcroft is the perfect candidate. He was a Member of the Senate, a governor, and an attorney general of the State of Missouri. I am told that he is amiable among his friends and has a good sense of humor. However, in determining the suitability of a nominee to serve as the highest law enforcement official of the country, we must take great care and look below the surface. We must look to his record and find the truth of his character from the actions he has taken at different times. I have examined that record and believe that Mr. Ashcroft is an unfortunate choice to head the Department of Justice.

I would not make such a statement lightly. As the New York Times said in an editorial which appeared on January 23: "Any reasonable reading of the extensive Judiciary Committee testimonies shows that Mr. Ashcroft's zeal has overruled prudence in cases that bear directly on issues relevant to the Department of Justice. Mr. Ashcroft's record on civil rights marks him as out of the mainstream of American ideals."

Poll after poll has shown that the vast majority of Americans favor equal rights for all people. Most Americans take pride in the strength and courage this country has shown to come from the ugly days of segregation and Jim Crow to the America we now know. And while much remains to be done, few are willing to return to the bitter days of yesteryear. Yet it would seem that Mr. Ashcroft does not share these views because Mr. Ashcroft has opposed every major civil rights bill during his tenure in the Senate.

Not only has his opposition to civil rights involved attempting to thwart the passage of laws, but it has involved attempting to block confirmation of individuals that he thinks might carry out these laws. During the Clinton administration, he led the fight against the confirmation of Bill Lann Lee as Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights. Despite Mr. Lee's unquestioned and impeccable credentials, Mr. Ashcroft objected to Mr. Lee because Mr. Lee had opposed proposition 209, a California measure that eliminated af-

firmative action in California. Mr. Lee was never confirmed.

Even more troubling for someone who seeks to be Attorney General, Mr. Ashcroft's opposition to civil rights apparently includes blocking lawfully issued orders of Federal courts. When Mr. Ashcroft was the attorney general for Missouri, he was the State's top lawyer in the key stages of a court battle to end separate and unequal education. Twenty-five years after *Brown v. the Board of Education*, St. Louis schools still needed to come into compliance with the Supreme Court's ruling in this landmark case. John Ashcroft blocked the parties in the suit from developing a plan for voluntary desegregation and actively obstructed implementation of court orders. He filed appeal after appeal. His efforts caused unusually harsh criticism from the courts.

After repeated delays and failure to comply by Mr. Ashcroft, the court threatened in March of 1981 to hold the State in contempt. In its order, the court order explicitly criticized the State's continual delay and failure to comply with court orders. The court stated that "the court can only draw one conclusion, the State has as a matter of deliberate policy decided to defy the authority of the court."

And again in 1981, Ashcroft even opposed a plan by the Reagan administration for voluntary desegregation. Even more troubling, in 1984, he based his gubernatorial primary campaign on his zealous opposition to the voluntary school desegregation plans for St. Louis schools. This is a troubling intersection of the use of the law for political gain.

Yet all of this could be forgiven if Mr. Ashcroft had demonstrated an ability to work with those who differed with him. In the role of Attorney General of the United States, one must meet with many people with divergent interests and complicated agendas. Yet despite all of his experience in politics and government, I am afraid that Mr. Ashcroft has not built a reputation as one who seeks compromise and understanding.

For instance, in 1993 when seeking to become chair of the Republican National Committee, members of his own party criticized Mr. Ashcroft's unwillingness to work cooperatively with those whose views differed from his. According to a quote which appeared in the St. Louis Post Dispatch on January 10, 1993, a fellow Republican from Missouri, State Senator Robert Johnson, said that Ashcroft "won't take criticism. And if you disagree with him, he knocks you out of the loop like you don't exist." And this is the most troubling thing of all, because, as Mr. William Raspberry wrote in the Washington Post, Mr. Ashcroft "seems certain to be a highly divisive force in an administration committed to healing across lines of party, ideology and race."

While I hope that the Senate takes heed to these concerns, I understand

that Mr. Ashcroft may succeed in his quest to become Attorney General. Let me take this opportunity to say now that if Mr. Ashcroft is confirmed, he will have a strong obligation to staff the Justice Department with people of demonstrated fairness and integrity and to show that they can administer the law evenhandedly. I hope that if he is confirmed, he will remember that it was his record of divisiveness that has marred his confirmation process. I hope he decides to follow President Bush's promise to be a uniter, not a divider.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK).

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I say to our Member from Ohio, the distinguished judge and prosecutor, for not only leading the issue today but for her forthrightness in bringing to this body such legislative and judicial experience, prosecutorial experience that certainly has helped us, we appreciate her leadership, and I thank her very much.

Today, this afternoon or tomorrow, the United States Senate will vote on the next Attorney General. There has been much discussion about Senator Ashcroft for the last month now. Extensive hearings have been held. Much media has had its coverage. And even in this body as women in this Chamber today walked over to the Senate Chamber to stand with those opposing his nomination, we come today to a very sad time in American history. To be the top lawyer, the number one lawyer in our country requires that the person be noble, that they be intelligent, that they understand the world in which they live, and that they understand that this is a very diverse economy and country that we live in. The person should also be sensitive to the needs of the poor, the disenfranchised, and those who need a little bit more help from their government.

This is said to be the greatest country in the world. We are certainly the richest country in the world and in a position to offer more to our citizens than we offer today. The Attorney General being selected either today or tomorrow is lacking in many of the qualities that I believe are necessary in an Attorney General and the main lawyer for our country.

Forty-six years ago, *Brown v. Board of Education* was had in court and passed, a desegregation case that said open up the schools, 46 years ago, so that children could work side by side from different nationalities and partake of a quality education. *Brown v. Board of Education*. Senator Ashcroft has not only tested the rightfulness of that decision of *Brown v. Board of Education* which allowed all of America's children to receive quality education in integrated classrooms but has challenged its validity, and I think that is wrong for someone who will be the top lawyer for our country.

Roe v. Wade just celebrated over 25 years of sound judgment that this

country has lived under for over 25 years. Senator Ashcroft has challenged and tested Roe v. Wade on more than one occasion. It is one thing to have strong beliefs, and we all live in a great society where we can do that and express our differences, but it is quite another on the one hand to disqualify Bill Lann Lee as our civil rights expert as he did on many occasions because of his views; and here we stand today, hours away of nominating a young man who has very, very different views from many Americans, and the same barometer is not being used. There is something tragically wrong with that.

It was mentioned earlier that Ambassador Hormel was going for his hearing, asking for a hearing before the Senate so that he could be confirmed. Ambassador Hormel is a homosexual, and everyone knows that and it is all right in our country. We support that. People are what they are. God has given them the right to be that. This country validates that and not one of us because of race, religion, ethnicity or our hetero or homosexual tendencies should keep us from serving our country. It has been documented that Senator Ashcroft would not even give Ambassador Hormel a hearing. That is wrong.

So if you talk about from affirmative action to hate crimes, to access to the process through hearings so that you can be heard, Senator Ashcroft does not meet the test. He should not be confirmed as our Attorney General.

Further, Senator Ashcroft received an honorary degree from Bob Jones University, who again lost their tax status on more than one occasion because of the policies of that university. Now we have a Senator who received an honorary degree from the university, nominated and soon to be confirmed as our next Attorney General.

I think it is unfortunate that President Bush made such a volatile announcement and nomination of Senator Ashcroft at this time, at a time when we have gone through a very turbulent election, when many Americans feel that they were not treated fairly, votes were not counted, not allowed to vote, very angry, even as we speak today, that we come here today as Members of this House of Representatives, standing strong, asking the Senate to take an action that the American people would want them to take.

□ 1515

Mr. Speaker, this is a serious time. It is not too late to withdraw that nomination. To put an American citizen there who will enforce the laws and not bring their own views into the law. This country cannot afford to be fragmented much more.

This past election demonstrated that we are a great country. Those same circumstances in another country would have blood in the street. I do not advocate that. We are a country and we settle our differences, but let us not fool each other. These are perilous times. These are critical times.

Today it was announced that the surplus is larger than ever before, ever even than 6 months ago. Are we going to invest in America's schools and children and health centers and seniors? It is important that all of this be considered and that as we talk about Senator Ashcroft today and whether he will be confirmed or not, look at the views of the man. We are a greater country than that. We need people to serve who will represent all of the people.

I do not believe that Senator Ashcroft has the ability, has the sensitivity or is able to represent over half of the American citizenry.

Mr. Speaker, today we have an opportunity to say our remarks, to share with Senator Ashcroft who, I am told, will be confirmed. We hope you listen, Senator. We hope that you will enforce the laws on the books and not try to change them. We hope that you will be sensitive to civil rights issues, affirmative action, hate crimes. We hope that you will allow people hearings who come before your body so that they can be rightfully heard in this just society that we live in. I hope you are listening, Senator Ashcroft. We are going to be watching you.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOKSEY). The Chair would advise that although Members may air their views concerning nominees for Cabinet posts, it is not in order to urge action on the part of the Senate or to characterize Senate action. That is in acknowledgment of the independence of the Senate.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) has 18 minutes.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, after 3 days of confirmation hearings and a Senate Committee on the Judiciary vote, I still insist that John Ashcroft has definitely not made his case for appointment as U.S. Attorney General. Instead, Congress and the public have witnessed a confirmation strategy that consists of misleading characterizations, factual errors and evasion.

When convenient during his confirmation hearings, Mr. Ashcroft has feigned memory loss as he did in response to inquiries regarding his opposition to Judge Margaret McKeown. Yet in a 1997 speech before The Heritage Foundation, he referred to her efforts in a lawful ballot initiative campaign as sinister and labeled her and her ACLU friends as liberal elitists.

When pressed for answers to persistent inquiries, Mr. Ashcroft deferred to a need for consultation with Department of Justice officials, as in his response regarding enforcement of Attorney General Reno's prohibition of inquiries into the sexual orientation of department employees.

Another tactic used by Mr. Ashcroft when the questions made him uncom-

fortable was to reply, quote, "I do not think I want to discuss that any longer," quote/unquote.

We saw that tactic when he was questioned on his opposition to the appointment of Ambassador Hormel, the ambassador to Luxembourg, who was subsequently confirmed by an 80 to 11 vote in the Senate. Ambassador Hormel's appointment was made while the Senate was in recess due in great part to Mr. Ashcroft's opposition to the ambassador's, quote, "life-style," quote/unquote.

Mr. Ashcroft said in 1998 during the confirmation process that Ambassador Hormel, quote, "has been a leader in promoting a life-style likely to be offensive in the setting to which he will be assigned," quote/unquote.

Mr. Ashcroft made the observations, even though Ambassador Hormel had received bipartisan support, endorsement by then Secretary of State George Schultz, and the government of Luxembourg.

Under questioning during the recent hearings, Mr. Ashcroft remarked easily that he was, quote, "not prepared to re-debate that nomination," quote/unquote.

Then there is the, quote, just trust me John Ashcroft, who asks us to believe that he can be new, but only if he is confirmed. We saw this tactic in all of his responses to questions concerning a woman's right to choose. The fact is that in matters of a woman's right to choose, freedom of choice, Mr. Ashcroft has exhibited a zealous opposition to Roe v. Wade while a State and Federal official. In spite of his career-long attempt to overturn Roe, he has stated without credibility during the hearings that the Roe decision is the settled law of the land, which he will enforce. We cannot and should not expect John Ashcroft to retreat in his persistent campaign against a woman's right to reproductive options.

Mr. Ashcroft has said he is a man of principle. Let us take a look at a few more of his principles in action. As Missouri's attorney general and governor, Mr. Ashcroft vigorously opposed voluntary desegregation plans submitted by St. Louis city and county school districts. When those plans were subsequently approved and ordered by the Federal district court, Mr. Ashcroft continued in his opposition, arguing that the Court could not implement an intradistrict remedy, although voluntary, for an intradistrict violation.

In at least three appeals, the Supreme Court rejected Mr. Ashcroft's argument as often as he made it, agreeing with the lower courts that the State was the primary constitutional violator. The appeals court also referred to Missouri's history of school segregation and reminded Mr. Ashcroft that in the past in order to ensure educational apartheid, the State bused suburban black students from St. Louis County into the city's black schools in order to maintain the dual system.

Ironically, a statutorily mandated intradistrict scheme to maintain segregation was acceptable for years while a voluntary intradistrict attempt to eliminate segregation was declared too costly and disruptive by Mr. Ashcroft and school desegregation opponents.

Remaining among the most vicious misrepresentations associated with the consideration of Mr. Ashcroft for confirmation is his wholly unethical campaign against Judge Ronnie White. The record cannot overemphasize the fact that after receiving bipartisan support for a Federal judgeship, support that included Missouri Senator BOND, John Ashcroft sabotaged Judge White's confirmation after the hearings, the committee hearings, at a time when Judge White could not respond to Mr. Ashcroft's distortions of his record.

Judge White's record on capital punishment did not differ appreciably from that of any other jurists who were successfully confirmed with Mr. Ashcroft's consent and support. In the case of Judge White, deliberate misrepresentation, cowardly sabotage, and a double standard were all instruments in Mr. Ashcroft's drive to promote his own reelection.

These are a few of the principles that have in practice guided Mr. Ashcroft's actions. These are the principles that speak more loudly than any confirmation hearing denials. Questions regarding Mr. Ashcroft's record and his fitness to serve as the Nation's top prosecutor have not been answered satisfactorily. Accordingly, the Nation should not suffer the appointment of Mr. Ashcroft as Attorney General. He has demonstrated over and over again that he is unwilling to travel a path forward to needed social progress. As guardians of the Nation's future, we cannot sit idly by and watch Mr. Ashcroft be confirmed without strong opposition, and while we have been encouraged and urged not to advocate what should be done about him by the Members, I just hope and I just pray that the Members do the right thing. I do not need to tell them what to do. He has defined himself very well. I think they know what to do. He should not be confirmed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of this special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

POINTS OF ORDER

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, because of some misunderstanding, I would make a point of order and ask unanimous consent to have the time extended to allow the people who I have remaining to speak. Can I do that?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The request of the gentlewoman from Ohio may not be entertained.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. May I inquire of the Speaker why?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 2 of rule XVII, a Member may not address the House for longer than 1 hour.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. This is a point of order. I hope I am not using up my time. Up until one speaker, before this speaker, the speaker was acting on the time; and it was my thought that that was how the time operated, sir; and so I wanted to be able to get some additional time to allow the rest of the people I have here to speak, especially on an issue as important as this confirmation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair regrets any misunderstanding, but here is the practice: A Member who is recognized to control time during special orders may yield to colleagues for such amounts of time as she may deem appropriate, but may not yield blocks of time to be enforced by the Chair. Members regulate the duration of their yielding by reclaiming the time when appropriate.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes under Special Orders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman may take that Special Order after the pending time has expired.

There was no objection.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentlewoman from the great State of Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank very much the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES), and I thank her for her leadership on this issue.

I thank my colleagues for coming to the floor of this House at a time when it might be more comfortable for us to just drift off into the distant sunset, but I am always reminded that it is not the test of character where one stands in times of comfort and ease but where one stands in times of battle and challenge. Though there may be no other voices that raise up against the confirmation of the Attorney General of the United States, I am proud to stand with those who would speak for the voiceless in America, for there are millions of Americans whose voices will not be heard when the vote is taken and there is such a confirmation.

My colleagues have chronicled the record and philosophy of this nominee, but the real question becomes to answer the question for America and for this body. What is the value and the importance of the Attorney General and the Department of Justice? It is not a question of whether we are recklessly opposing someone because they have fundamentally different beliefs than what I have, but the Department of Justice is what it symbolizes. It is the refuge for the voiceless and the disenfranchised.

In the 1960s, in the civil rights movement, as Martin Luther King, Jr., in

the segregated South, it was the Justice Department that came riding in to preserve the sanctity of the Union, and for us to be able to express the opposition to a segregated and violent America.

It was the Justice Department and the President of the United States that utilized that leadership when it was necessary for the Little Rock 9 to enter into the high schools so that there could be integration and an implementation of Brown v. Topeka in the case that was before the Supreme Court. And so the Justice Department is the refuge and the Attorney General is the captain.

If this nominee is confirmed, that captain will steer the ship wrong. There will be no refuge for women who under the law have the right to utilize Roe v. Wade. There will be no refuge for those of us who pushed for desegregation of this Nation. There will be no refuge for millions of Americans who were disenfranchised in the last election and question whether or not there is support for voting and enforcing the Voter Rights Act of 1965.

Then there will be the question of appointments, the Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights, the protection and understanding of the rights of immigrants, respect for secret evidence, a law that was passed, realizing that immigrants have rights and that we should not be in a position in this Nation to bash people because they are different. We can all join in in believing that there should be law and order; but at the same time who will enforce the rights not only of the victim, which I support, in supporting their rights, but the innocent convicted defendant incarcerated, the wrong person, when we talk about using DNA?

□ 1530

What will be the position of this Attorney General when all of his legal background and his public service have been in opposition to this?

If I might just say this: I sat through the hearings and I testified with respect to my opposition to this nomination. I cannot suggest to the other body what they should do. I can only plead with them on behalf of those whose voices will not be heard that if there is one place in this country where those who are less than what many would want them to be, who are poor, who are downtrodden, who are incarcerated, who seek to have laws enforced, if there is anyplace that one can go and seek fairness, it has to be in the Department of Justice.

Mr. Speaker, I close with these two points of contention. In those hearings, Attorney General-to-be or nominee Ashcroft was asked if he followed the law as the Attorney General in Missouri, not whether or not he believed or had a philosophy different from any one of us, and, of course, he suggested that he did follow the law. But yet, during the bitter 10-year legal battle against voluntary desegregation, and I

said voluntary, where the community came together, he was cited by the Federal court and he was criticized, and the language is as follows: his continual delay and failure to comply with court orders, and concluded that the State has, as a matter of deliberate policy, decided to defy the authority of a court. That is who my Republican colleagues think can follow the law.

Lastly, when he was asked whether or not he opposed Judge Ronnie White for any other reason, he noted that he did not derogate his background, but yet Ashcroft, in opposing him, indicated that White, a judge that had voted 60 percent with the Ashcroft appointees of the State, would use his lifetime appointment to push law in a pro-criminal direction, consistent with his own political agenda. When have we ever heard that the courts and the judges who take an oath of office have done so?

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for allowing me to join in with my colleagues. The real question is, will we close the doors of justice with the confirmation of an individual who has seemingly exemplified whatever his beliefs are, questionable vigoriveness in enforcing the law of the land? Be not afraid to stand up and to suggest that there should be another direction for this Nation. I have no fear, and I hope the rest of America has none as well.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to oppose the nomination of John Ashcroft for Attorney General of the United States. Today, I walked in solidarity with fellow women members of the Democratic Caucus to the Senate floor to oppose the Ashcroft confirmation. At least fifteen Members of the Democratic Women's Caucus participated in this solemn protest concerning the confirmation battle. We came together and witnessed the debate in the Senate Chamber up close and personal.

I am here today to speak out not only as a Member of Congress, but as a citizen of our diverse and vulnerable nation.

The Senate is moving perilously close to taking final action on Mr. Ashcroft's confirmation. This causes me great anxiety in light of the fact that a growing number of Americans are demonstrating in every state of the Union against the Ashcroft confirmation.

Based on Mr. John Ashcroft's voting record of aggressive opposition to women's rights, civil rights, and the unfortunate handling of the nomination of Judge Ronnie White, the Senate Judiciary Committee and its colleagues should vote down his nomination for the sake of unifying America. The Attorney General for the United States should support laws that protect all of America's people. It is unfortunate that ratings by the Christian Coalition, the National Right to Life Committee, and the American Conservative Union show that throughout his 6 years in the U.S. Senate, John Ashcroft has been a consistent and reliable vote in opposing the certified law of the land. I am not questioning Mr. Ashcroft's personal probity; I am vigorously questioning his suitability for the job for which he has been selected.

Mr. Ashcroft's record on matters of race has been simply disappointing. According to the Washington Times, Ashcroft received a grade

of 'F' on each of the last three NAACP report cards because of his anti-progressive voting record, having voted to approve only 3 of 15 legislative issues supported by the NAACP and other civil rights groups. This explains why such a broad number of groups are so strongly united against his confirmation as the next Attorney General of the United States.

Mr. Ashcroft opposed the approval of Judge Ronnie White to the Federal Bench. In 1997, President Clinton nominated Judge White of the Missouri Supreme Court to be a United States District Court Judge. At the hearings on his nomination in May 1998, Judge White was introduced to the Senate Judiciary Committee by Republican Senator CHRISTOPHER BOND, who told the committee that Judge White "has the necessary qualifications and character traits which are required for this most important job." See Confirmation Hearings on Federal Appointments: Hearings Before the Senn. Comm. On the Judiciary, 15th Cong., 2d Sess. 7-8 (1998).

We all know that John Ashcroft led a campaign to defeat the nomination of Missouri's first African-American Supreme Court Justice, Judge Ronnie White, to the federal bench. Mr. Ashcroft seriously distorted White's record, portraying it as pro criminal, and anti-death penalty, and even suggested, according to the London Guardian, that "the judge had shown a tremendous bent toward criminal activity." Ironically, Judge White had voted to uphold the death sentence in 41 of the 59 cases that came before him, roughly the same proportion as Ashcroft's court appointees when he was Governor.

In fact, of these 59 death penalty cases, Judge White was the sole dissenter in only three of them. As a matter of fact, three of the other Missouri Supreme Court judges, all of whom were appointed by Mr. Ashcroft as Governor, voted to reverse death penalty cases in greater percentage of cases than did Judge White. Ashcroft also failed to consider or mention that in at least fifteen death penalty cases Missouri Supreme Court Justice, Ronnie White, wrote the majority opinion for the court to uphold the death sentence. America owes an apology to Judge White and I admire his ability to move forward with his life. This is a judicial nominee for which Mr. Ashcroft had no substantial reason to oppose—and it is time that America knows the facts.

I took my responsibility in helping shed light on Judge White's confirmation hearing before the Senate Judiciary Committee on the 17th of January of this month with great seriousness. I felt compelled to have my voice heard on behalf of Judge White who had never been given the chance to defend himself from vicious attacks on his impeccable judicial record. More importantly, each Senator and Representative now knows that when Judge White's nomination was brought to the Senate floor in October 1999, Senator Ashcroft spearheaded a successful party-line fight to defeat White's confirmation, the first time in 12 years (since the vote on Robert Bork) that the full Senate had voted to reject a nominee to the Federal bench.

In contrast to that effort, as former Congressman William L. Clay introduced Judge Ronnie White before the Senate Judiciary Committee he said the following: "I might cite one incident that attests to the kind of relationship that Judge White has with many, and that

is with a member of this committee—Senator Ashcroft. When I recommended Judge White to the President for nomination and the President nominated him, one of the first people that I conferred with was Senator Ashcroft. At a later date, he told me that he had appointed six of the seven members to the Missouri Supreme Court. Ronnie White was the only one he had not appointed. He said he had canvassed the other six, the ones that he appointed, and they all spoke very highly of Ronnie White and suggested that he would make an outstanding Federal Judge. So I think that this is the kind of person we need on the Federal bench." Confirmation Hearings on Federal Appointments: Hearings Before the Sen. Comm. On the Judiciary, 105th Cong., 2d Sess. 7-8 (1998).

John Ashcroft, if confirmed would not be a guardian of women's right to reproductive choice as provided by the Supreme Court's decision in *Roe v. Wade*. On the contrary, Mr. Ashcroft supports a constitutional amendment that would outlaw abortion even in cases of incest and rape and that would criminalize several commonly used forms of contraception.

As Missouri attorney general and Governor, and more recently in the Senate, he repeatedly used his office as a U.S. Senator to push through severe new restrictions on women's reproductive freedom as part of an effort to get the Supreme Court to overturn *Roe v. Wade*. It is fair to say that many women in America have a right to be concerned because as Attorney General, Ashcroft could use the power the Federal Government behind new strategies to defeat the right to an abortion in the Supreme Court. It is also reasonable to express doubts about whether he would fully enforce laws that insure access to abortion clinics by limiting violent or obstructive demonstrations by abortion opponents.

We all look at the Attorney General to ensure even-handed law enforcement and protection of our basic constitutional rights: freedom of speech, the right to privacy, a woman's right to choose, freedom from governmental oppression and other vital functions. We cannot deny the Attorney General plays a critical role in bringing the country together, bridging racial divides, and inspiring people's confidence in their government.

Accordingly, as I review the series of questionable acts that can be found in Mr. Ashcroft's record as a public servant, I find such action by Mr. Ashcroft to be inconsistent with the kind of vision and tolerance that the next top law enforcement officer will need to exhibit. Mr. Ashcroft's record on desegregation in the State of Missouri is one of those examples that makes me truly sad as an African-American and I have an obligation to emphasize this very grave matter.

John Ashcroft, as Attorney General and as Governor of the State of Missouri consistently opposed efforts to desegregate schools in Missouri, which for more than 150 years, had legally sanctioned separate and inferior education for blacks.

Missouri has a long and marked history of systematically discriminating against African-Americans in the provision of public education. During the years of slavery, the State forbid the education of blacks. After the Civil War, Missouri was the most northern state to have a constitutional mandate requiring separate schools for blacks and whites. This constitutional provision remained in place until 1976.

For much of its history, Missouri provided vastly inferior services to black students.

After the Supreme Court's ruling in *Brown v. Board of Education*, the Missouri Attorney General's office, rather than ordering the dismantling of segregation, simply issued an opinion stating that local districts "may permit" white and colored children to attend the same schools, and could decide for themselves whether they must integrate. Local school districts in St. Louis and Kansas City perpetuated segregation by manipulating attendance boundaries, drawing discriminatory busing plans and building new schools in places to keep races apart.

The now well-known St. Louis case, which was debated in these proceedings before the Senate Judiciary Committee, was filed in 1972. In brief, St. Louis had adhered to an explicit system of racial segregation throughout the 1960s. White students were assigned to schools in their neighborhood; black students attended black schools in the core of the city. Black students who resided outside the city were bused into the black schools in the city. The city had launched no effort to integrate; it simply adopted neighborhood school assignment plans that maintained racial segregation.

Senator Ashcroft, then the Attorney General, challenged the desegregation plan. He argued that there was no basis for holding the State liable and that the State had taken the "necessary and appropriate steps to remove the legal underpinnings of segregated schooling as well as affirmatively prohibiting such discrimination." The courts rejected his attempts; even the U.S. Supreme Court denied certiorari.

In 1983, the city school Board and the 22 suburban districts all agreed to a "unique and compressive" settlement, implementing a voluntary 5-year school desegregation plan for both the city and the county. Importantly, the plan was voluntary—it relied on voluntary transfers by students rather than so-called "forced busing." The district court approved this plan.

Attorney General Ashcroft, representing the State, was the only one that did not join the settlement. He opposed all aspects of the settlement. In fact, he sought to have it overturned by the Eighth Circuit. The Eighth Circuit upheld most of the provisions of the plan, and emphasized that three times over the prior three years, specifically held that the State was the primary constitutional violator. Can this man be the next Attorney General of the United States of America.

We need a nominee that enforces the civil rights laws of the Nation, that brings strength and confidence to the top law enforcement post of our great country, and to affirm equal protection and fundamental fairness in the United States of America. We owe at least that much to the working people of America and all those who believe the United States remains an example of basic fairness and justice for all.

I strongly believe that some of the beliefs of Senator John Ashcroft are archaic and obsolete. This country has come so far in improving civil rights and fundamental fairness. The confirmation of John Ashcroft will set us years back after all the improvements that have been made. This would be a travesty.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this

time, and I commend her for calling this Special Order.

I too rise to express my opposition to the nomination of former Senator John Ashcroft, a man who has spoken repeatedly against gun control, against a woman's right to choose, against affirmative action, against integration of schools, against the Miranda rights of suspects. How can we have this person, as our President wants to nominate and has nominated, and who opposes a qualified person like Bill Lan Lee, who said that even though you are great and I hear what you say, I just do not believe you can do what you say; against Frederica Massiah-Jackson for Federal judgeship; against Dr. David Satcher, one of the tremendous physicians in this country for Surgeon General; against Dr. Foster, another candidate for Surgeon General; against Ronnie White, who, in 71 percent of the cases voted for the death penalty, where Mr. Ashcroft voted for another person who only voted for the death penalty 55 percent, who happened not to be African American.

Finally, when a person said that receiving a doctorate degree, honorary doctorate degree from Bob Jones University, that after he swore he was telling the truth, and when he looked into that camera, when he was asked about that university, Senator Ashcroft sat in that seat and said, in 1999, in June of 1999, that I did not know what Bob Jones University stood for, when George Bush went there to campaign and McCain went there to campaign, and the whole question of when President Bush apologized to the Catholics because he said that he should not have gone there because they are antiCatholic, and never said a word about the antiblack. But that was our new President that wants to bring all people in. I just cannot understand how Senator Ashcroft could put his hand on the Bible, put his hand up to God and say, I did not know, less than a year ago, what Bob Jones University stood for.

Mr. Speaker, for those reasons, I do not think he is qualified to be the Attorney General of the United States of America.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Speaker for the additional 1 minute. In light of our discussion, very quickly, the relief for the minorities over the years have come through the courts. This year, we were let down by the United States Supreme Court in their decision that ultimately decided the election that allowed President Bush to become President. We were then let down by the executive, the President, by nominating John Ashcroft to be Attorney General. We need the legislature, even though we cannot urge them to vote in any way; the Senate, the only remaining branch of government who has not yet acted, to stand up for Americans, stand up for minorities, stand up for women, stand up for gays and lesbians, and stand up for all Americans, and not confirm the nomination of John Ashcroft.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOKSEY). The Chair urges all Members not to urge action of Members of the Senate.

OPPOSING ATTORNEY GENERAL NOMINATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking Democrat on the House Committee on the Judiciary and the senior Member of the Congressional Black Caucus, I am unalterably opposed to John Ashcroft's nomination to be Attorney General of the United States. I have reached this decision with some regret and consternation. In my 36 years in Congress, I have never publicly opposed a nominee for Attorney General. However, in the present case, my reservations about the Senator's ability and inclinations to support and uphold the law in such critical areas as civil rights, reproductive choice and gun safety are so grave; and his pattern of misleading and disingenuous responses at his confirmation hearings so serious, that I believe it is in the national interests that his nomination be either withdrawn or rejected by the Senate.

I am also concerned that the Senator's personal lack of responsiveness to me foreshadows a pattern of conscious avoidance or, at best, benign neglect of me and my colleagues in the House.

First, in terms of civil rights, I am troubled by the fact that notwithstanding Senator Ashcroft's general statements about support for civil rights enforcement, he declined to state specific agreement with the Department's position in a host of civil rights cases, including its support of the University of Michigan's affirmative action program.

I am also dismayed that the Senator has taken public positions opposing voluntary school desegregation, and that he wrongly asserted that the State had done nothing wrong, and was quote, found guilty of no wrong, end quote, in the Missouri desegregation cases.

As we all know, there are two separate Federal Court of Appeals decisions and numerous district court decisions holding the State expressly responsible for the unconstitutional discrimination that occurred. I am also profoundly disappointed in the manner by which the Senator thwarted Judge Ronnie White's nomination to be Federal district court judge, the first African American justice ever to serve on the Missouri Supreme Court. Senator Ashcroft's unwillingness at his confirmation to acknowledge or to express a scintilla of regret for the disingenuous manner in which he distorted

Judge White's record can hardly be seen as a promising omen to those of us in the African American community who have worked so hard to integrate the Federal judiciary.

Second, given Senator Ashcroft's past record and statements at the hearings, I do not find his acknowledgment of a woman's constitutional right to an abortion as settled law under Roe and Casey as being at all credible. I say this because in 42 out of 43 Senate votes concerning reproductive rights, he cast a vote aimed at overturning Roe versus Wade.

Third, with regard to Senator Ashcroft's record of opposition to gun control legislation, I remain unconvinced that he is the appropriate person to uphold and enforce our Nation's firearms law. To me, Senator Ashcroft's past wholehearted embrace of an extreme view of the second amendment is active support for legislation in Missouri that would allow individuals to carry concealed weapons and his unwillingness to commit to relinquish his membership in the National Rifle Association, disqualify him as the person best charged with enforcing our gun laws. In sum, I have come to the reluctant conclusion that the Senator is the wrong man for the wrong job at the wrong time.

When our Nation urgently needs an Attorney General who can bring us all together, we have been offered a person known for extreme right-wing positions and divisiveness. I have spent my entire career fighting for the cause of civil rights, reproductive choice and common sense crime and gun safety laws. In my view, Senator Ashcroft's record is simply too inconsistent with these goals to justify our support for him.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to and commend the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) for calling this Special Order and bringing us all together this evening.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would just state to the gentleman that I thank him for his leadership on the Committee on the Judiciary and trust that our work together will not allow this confirmation to proceed.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the nomination of John Ashcroft of Missouri to the crucial position of United States Attorney General. Mr. Ashcroft has a long and consistent record of conservative extremism, opposing civil rights as well as qualified Federal nominees, abortion rights, gay rights and environmental protection.

In his confirmation hearings last week, we saw a nominee on his best behavior, and yet, he could not acknowledge the possibility that he was wrong about the impeccable qualifications of federal judge nominee Ronnie White. We have a nominee who denies that sexual preference was an issue when he questioned James Hormel's "life-style" before rejecting his nomination. We have a nominee who claims that as Attorney General of Missouri he always upheld the law and did not try and impose his own personal beliefs while the record shows that just the opposite is true. In fact,

there is nothing in the record to indicate that Mr. Ashcroft has ever exhibited any flexibility in his ideology.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you should we support giving him the keys to our nation's laws with our eyes opened and our fingers crossed.

I cannot remain silent when the person who is nominated to be the chief law enforcement officer of this country and who will be responsible for defending the civil rights of all Americans has repeatedly demonstrated his personal animosity for those fundamental rights. I urge the Administration to live up to its promises to unite this country and withdraw this ill-conceived nominee from consideration. At the very least, I urge my friends in the other Chamber to do the right thing and reject this nominee.

THE WAR AGAINST DRUGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I will not take the entire hour, but I did want to rise and summarize a trip that I took last week to Colombia and Ecuador to inform our colleagues and our constituents about the progress being made in the war against drugs.

To be honest, Mr. Speaker, last year I was concerned when the President and the administration requested \$1.3 billion to be used in the war against drugs in Colombia and South America. I was concerned because I was not sure that it was the right approach for us to be taking; that perhaps it would send the wrong signals, and that perhaps this should not be an issue in which the American military is involved.

Mr. Speaker, I went to Ecuador and Colombia to see firsthand what is happening with those dollars, what is happening with our effort to interact with the leadership of Ecuador and Colombia to see what role we are playing and what role they are playing in solving this problem. I came back, Mr. Speaker, convinced that we made the right decision.

I come to the floor this afternoon to encourage our colleagues to get more information about what is happening in Latin America, to better understand the type of threat that exists there, to understand the importance of what we are doing in Latin America in the war against drugs, and to understand that there will be additional requests for dollars this year in the President's budget and the requests coming to this Congress to continue this fight for at least a 5-year period.

□ 1545

Mr. Speaker, I started my trip in Ecuador in Quito, the capitol, where I met with and had a briefing with our Ambassador, Ambassador Gwen Clare, and with her in-country team, including the military. I had a full briefing on the impact in Ecuador of the activi-

ties involved with Plan Colombia. I heard from the Ecuadorian leadership that while Ecuador did receive some support from this program, approximately \$20 million, there is simply a greater need, both in terms of supporting their military efforts and the economic efforts, particularly along the northern rim of Ecuador, in dealing with the overflow of the drug cartels in Colombia.

I also discussed with the Ecuadorian leaders, the issue of the Galapagos and the Environmental Damage being caused by the ship, that just a few days earlier, had crashed off of the coast of the Galapagos, and what we in America could do to assist Ecuador.

In fact, in coming away from that trip, I was convinced that Ecuador, being the key ally that it has been with America is, in fact, a country that we should renew our focus on. In meetings both before my trip and today, I met with the Ecuadorian ambassador to the United States, and I can tell you that she appreciates the effort that America has put forward and is willing to work with us on additional initiatives to cause further integration with the efforts of Ecuador in solving the drug problem and America in solving the drug problem.

In Colombia, Mr. Speaker, I met again where our in-country team, including our Ambassador, Ann Patterson, a very capable lady under very difficult circumstances. I met with our leadership, military leadership. I met with our CINC, our commanding officer for that region. I met with our military leaders from all the services.

I spent an hour meeting with the Defense Minister from Colombia, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the senior leaders of their military.

I also met with the general in charge of their police force that comes under the military, and then they flew me out to one of the base camps about an hour from Bogota near the FARC demilitarized zone, and I spent a half a day observing the training being provided by our troops to the Colombian military.

Let me give you some impressions, Mr. Speaker, for our colleagues. First of all, American troops are not being used in any combat mission whatsoever. As you know, Mr. Speaker, we imposed a limitation of 500 American troops in Latin America, in Colombia for the specifics of carrying out this plan, not one of our military is involved in any type of hostile action.

They are not involved in any kind of overt action against Colombia. They are simply there providing training. They are doing training for the Colombian military in terms of going out and running exploratory patrols of how to take apart these precursor labs. They are running training in how to guard the helicopters and the planes that are spraying the coca fields.

I can tell my colleagues, I was overwhelmingly impressed with our military. They are doing, as they always

do, an outstanding job. All of our special forces and our military personnel there speak fluent Spanish. And I can tell my colleagues the relationship they have established at the one base I visited in Larandia was absolutely exemplary.

The training that was going on was a reality training and the kinds of successes that the Colombian military is having, I think, is directly responsive to the efforts of the American military officers and enlisted personnel who are on the scene throughout Colombia.

We have a dangerous situation, Mr. Speaker, in that part of the world. Our focus in Washington from an national security standpoint has traditionally been on the former Soviet Union and the 15 republics of that nation, China, the Middle East, and the threats posed by countries like Iran, Iraq, Syria, Libya and North Korea. But, Mr. Speaker, I came away from my trip and my meetings convinced that one of the most troublesome threats that we faced right now in America is the huge amount of cocaine coming into our country, primarily from Colombia.

It is estimated that between 60 percent and 80 percent of all the cocaine used in America is produced in Colombia. On hundreds of thousands of acres of farmland that used to grow crops, used to grow coffee, used to grow the kinds of fruits and vegetables that Colombia and Latin America are famous for. When the FARC began its operations and the terrorists revolutionaries began their operations, they began to acquire a large area in Colombia, specifically, do grow initially marijuana, and then poppies, and now they are into coca, which is converted in local labs into cocaine, which is then sent back here to the States.

Mr. Speaker, it is now a multibillion dollar industry in Colombia. In fact, the estimates are the FARC is receiving perhaps as much as \$6 billion to \$7 billion a year in income, which has allowed the FARC, which has its own zone inside of Colombia that is absolutely isolated from the rest of the country. It has allowed the FARC to produce a military that has in excess of \$20,000 armed troops.

This military is well-trained. They have the latest in terms of communication systems, and they have an elaborate network in place to send that cocaine through whatever means possible to America, and they are doing that.

In fact, just a few weeks before I arrived in Colombia, we were able to confiscate, or the Colombians were able to confiscate a submarine that had been built with the assistance of Russian scientists that the FARC was going to use to move cocaine from Colombia to America.

Mr. Speaker, the FARC has become a major force that provides a threat to America's homeland defense. Now, I have worked for the 14 years I have been in Congress on issues involving the security threats coming from Russia. I was a member of the Cox com-

mittee that investigated the transfer of technology to China.

I was on the speaker's advisory group on North Korea. I have spent hours and hours focusing on the threats coming from those nations providing technology to unstable nations and to unstable groups. But I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, I am now convinced that one of the greatest threats that we face in the 21st century is the threat to our society from the continued growth of the cocaine industry in America, especially when this cocaine industry is supporting a major military establishment in Latin America, a destabilizing military establishment.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the FARC and the revolutionary groups are creating serious instability in the areas in Colombia where they, in fact, are secure. And they are now spilling over into north Ecuador, as well as having an impact in other Latin American countries.

The day before I arrived at the base camp at Larandia, there was intelligence that a FARC exploratory group was going to move into a small town, which is a typical operation for them. When they moved into that small town, they would burn the local police station, and they would hunt out the police officers and either intimidate them until they complied with the FARC or until they killed them.

Mr. Speaker, 3,000 individuals per year on average are kidnapped in Colombia. Many of them are police officers at the local level trying to provide protection for the people of the towns. The FARC and the revolutionaries have been going into small towns and villages wrecking havoc on the quality of life in those communities.

They have been taking peaceful farmers and forcing them to stop growing legitimate crops and instead produce the coca that the FARC then buys and uses at their precursor labs to produce cocaine, which is then shipped to America. And if the local farmers do not cooperate, they, too, are harassed.

Their buildings are burned. Their vehicles are trashed and burned, and in the end, the people themselves are tortured. But the FARC is doing far worse than that, Mr. Speaker, and so is the result of the narco-trafficking trade in Colombia.

The day before I arrived at Larandia, there was a confrontation. The military units of the Colombian base where I lived, Larandia, were sent out, because they had intelligence that indicated the FARC was going to raid a local community and take over its police department.

The Colombian military met the FARC unit on a small road outside the village. A firefight ensued. The FARC was equipped with AK47s, the latest weapons available for a military anywhere in the world today, bought with those billions of dollars of money, most of it coming from wealthy Americans wanting to have their coke, at the same time they are proclaiming that

somehow they are concerned about the drug problem in America.

Mr. Speaker, the confrontation that ensued resulted in the death of 3 FARC uniform personnel. One of the uniform personnel, Mr. Speaker, was a 12-year-old girl. The second FARC soldier that was killed was a 14-year-old boy, and the third FARC military person that was killed was a 17-year-old boy. And the mode of operation was the same as it always is with the FARC.

When they get into a confrontation with the Colombian military, which may occur, 100 yards or 200 yards away so the soldiers cannot see who they are up against, the FARC pushes young kids in uniform out in the front so they are the first to be killed. They are the first to die.

Mr. Speaker, this has happened time and time again throughout Colombia. In fact, with all of our concerns about the crimes of Saddam Hussein and Slobodan Milosevic, it is amazing to me that there is not an outcry in this country for a war crimes tribunal against the gross human atrocities being caused by the FARC and the revolutionary groups in Colombia and Latin America.

Because what is occurring there? The hundreds of deaths, the slaughtering of young children, the slaughtering of families, the forcing of farmers to grow these illegal crops and the devastation of local villages, is a gross kind of human rights abuse that I do not think we have seen the likes of since Saddam Hussein was in his prime back in Iraq before the invasion.

Mr. Speaker, we have no choice but to support the Colombians in this struggle and they are winning. They are making progress. The training is working.

Mr. Speaker, I insert for the RECORD a summary of counternarcotics operations in Putumayo, which is the hot bed of this activity in Colombia. This was prepared at my request by our Ambassador. I submit this for the RECORD for all of our colleagues to review and for all Americans to understand the success that is occurring in Colombia as we begin to eradicate hopefully 100 percent of the coca production in that country which has led to the huge proliferation of cocaine into America.

SUMMARY OF COUNTERNARCOTICS OPERATIONS
IN PUTUMAYO, DECEMBER 19, 2000–JANUARY
28, 2001

(Prepared for Representative Curt Weldon)

I. INTRODUCTION

The first six weeks of counternarcotics operations in Putumayo Department in southern Colombia (the initial geographical focus under Plan Colombia) have seen many positive results. Two social pacts supported by the U.S. Agency for International Development, which provide for voluntary manual eradication and alternative crop development, have been signed by over 1400 families in Puerto Asis municipality, and six more are expected to be signed before the end of March. Aerial coca eradication and ground interdiction activities have taken place in south-central and southwestern Putumayo. As of January 28, 2001, over 24,000 hectares

have been sprayed in Putumayo, the most densely cultivated area in the world. There has been an unprecedented level of cooperation between the Colombian Army Counterdrug Brigade and the Antinarcotics Directorate of the Colombian National Police. The operations have proceeded with relatively few incidents of armed clashes or ground fire directed at spray aircraft.

II. AERIAL ERADICATION

Although estimates vary, coca cultivation in Putumayo could be as high as 90,000 hectares (about 225,000 acres). The most dense areas of cultivation are located in southwestern Putumayo. Aerial eradication in Putumayo began in that area on December 22, 2000. As of January 28, 2001, a total of 24,123 hectares has been sprayed—22,332 hectares in southwestern Putumayo (mostly in paramilitary-dominated zones) and 1,791 hectares in south-central Putumayo. Spraying is currently taking place in southwestern Putumayo. There have been eight spray planes and/or escort helicopters hit by hostile ground fire (in six incidents) since commencement of spraying in Putumayo—fewer than expected, given the high presence of illegal armed groups operating in Putumayo. None resulted in any injury or serious damage to aircraft.

III. COLOMBIAN MILITARY OPERATIONS

As of January 28, 2001 there are approximately 3,000 Colombian Army troops deployed in Putumayo, including troops from the First and Second Counterdrug Battalions of the Counterdrug Brigade. The ground troops support aerial eradication activities and conduct lab interdictions. Since the start of operations in mid-December 2000, Colombian military forces have attacked 40 targets in Putumayo, including coca base labs, cocaine hydrochloride labs, and weapons storage facilities.

There have been five incidents of armed clashes between Colombian military forces and illegal groups since the start of Putumayo operations, one involving paramilitaries and three involving FARC. These clashes resulted in the deaths of two 12th Brigade soldiers, 11 FARC, and one paramilitary. The fifth incident was the firing (by unknown persons) of a rocket-propelled grenade at an embassy-contracted fuel plane (carrying Colombian National Police officers) departing Tres Esquinas.

The level of cooperation between Colombian military forces and antinarcotics police during the Putumayo operation has been unprecedented, given the historic rivalries between the various armed forces and police. The forces have shared USG-supplied helicopters to move troops and police in and out of the spray/interdiction areas. The Deputy Commander of the Counterdrug Brigade now attends the daily briefings for the spray pilots, hence is better able to deploy his troops into the most effective areas and to alert the pilots to suspected locations of hostile elements.

IV. U.S.-SUPPORTED ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT/MANUAL ERADICATION

A key aspect of the multifaceted Plan Colombia projects targeted for Putumayo (and, later, other parts of the country) is to encourage small coca growers to sign agreements to voluntarily eliminate their illicit crops in exchange for government assistance with alternative crop development. The U.S. Agency for International Development is working closely with the Government of Colombia's National Plan for Alternative Development (PLANTE), to put such agreements into place. Two agreements have been signed to date by a total of 1453 families in Puerto Asis municipality, providing for the voluntary elimination of nearly 3000 hectares

of coca. Six more agreements are expected to be signed before the end of March 2001. The target is to enter agreements with a total of 5500 families for the elimination of approximately 10,500 hectares of coca. The signing of even two elimination agreements has had a positive effect, in that many more families are interested in signing them now that they are perceived as a reality. The signings appear to have lessened some local officials' opposition to aerial eradication as well. While in the past they often complained that government efforts were focused on the "stick" of spraying but not the "carrot" of alternative development, at least one Putumayo mayor has stated that the government now apparently intends to keep its word to combine the two efforts.

V. HUMAN RIGHTS

Since the first Counterdrug Battalion was formed in April 1999, we have had no human rights complaints against the Counterdrug Brigade, nor have we received any since joint operations were launched in December 2000. There has been minimal displacement, with some 20-30 people displaced since spray operations began in mid-December. In contrast, thousands of people were displaced in the area between September-December 2000 as a result of the FARC's armed siege of Putumayo.

As required under the Leahy amendment, the Embassy vets all military and police units which receive USG assistance by reviewing the unit's human rights record and regular reports from the Colombian Ministry of Defense on any units or members of units which are undergoing formal investigation for human rights violations. The 24th Brigade, a member of the Joint Task Force-South under General Mario Montoya's command, is currently the only element of the Joint Task Force-South which is not approved to receive USG assistance.

VI. CONCLUSION

While the government of Colombia has achieved significant success in the first phase of U.S.-supported counternarcotics operations in Putumayo, much more remains to be done. Embassy is encouraging the Colombian Army and Antinarcotics Police to pursue more joint operations, and is encouraging the Colombian Presidency to explain Plan Colombia more clearly to its citizens. The Government of Colombia has shown the political will to maintain its commitment to the aerial eradication and interdiction aspects of Plan Colombia, even if violence escalates (as is likely to be the case). Public support for antinarcotics aid is strong, but continued close engagement at all levels will be required to maintain the GOC's resolve.

Mr. Speaker, in this two-page summary, our colleagues will find a detailed assessment of the successes that we are achieving, of the cooperation of the Colombian military, of the brave efforts being put forth by military leaders and police leaders who everyday are being intimidated and whose families are being threatened by the FARC and the terrorist groups throughout Colombia.

Mr. Speaker, I want to also assure my colleagues one of the major concerns we have in any country is that there not be human rights abuses by the military or the police of that country. In the training that I witnessed at the Larandia operation, a major part of our training program for the Colombian military deals with human rights, showing the soldiers on the ground in Colombia that while they are there, to

weed out the corrupt narcoterrorists activity.

They must adhere to strict human rights concerns that we have. They must comply with international norms. They must not abuse innocent people. And while there are still incidents as there are even in our own military, from time to time, of concerns relative to human rights. I can assure our colleagues that the Colombian military, the Colombian police department have made overwhelming positive strides in stopping human rights abuses from those who are enforcing the laws and from those who are going after the narcotics traffickers.

Mr. Speaker, our military again is rising to the occasion and doing an outstanding job. The Colombian soldier on the ground understands the importance of maintaining human rights and dignity, even when they are dealing with thugs involved, with growing and selling off cocaine eventually for America's soil.

This summary gives a glimpse of the kind of successes that we are having in each of these areas; the efforts at cleaning up the drug labs, the efforts at spraying the crops, the efforts at protecting the human rights, the efforts at helping to rebuild the economy of these areas that have been devastated by drug trafficking.

□ 1600

The role of America is not just training. We are also providing resources. Of the \$1.3 million that we are placing into Plan Colombia, only a small portion is actually going to our military. Significant parts of the money are going into nonmilitary activities, such as the Department of State. Other parts are going into activities involving economic readjustment.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I have a series of charts that I will be providing for every Member of the House that give an assessment as to where the \$1.3 million is going, the kinds of equipment that we are buying, helicopters to do spraying, and helicopters to accompany the helicopters and the planes that are doing the spraying of the crops.

So the effort in Plan Colombia is not just about helping the military. It is about providing a broad strategy. It is about building democratic institutions. It is about helping local mayors and local councils have better control over their communities. It is involving ourselves through Colombia in creating additional economic activities for farmers who no longer are going to produce these drugs.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that we must stay the course in Latin America. One of the concerns that I had when I traveled to Ecuador and Colombia was that we in America do not know enough about our southern partners. I am very pleased that our new President has made statements that he wants to reach south. He has already reached out to Mexico. I know that he

wants to reach out to Central and South America.

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that many of us, including myself, have not paid attention to our closest neighbors. We have not taken the opportunity to reach out to them as equal partners in terms of economic development, environmental cooperation, cooperation in health and human services, and also dealing with problems like the oil spill off the Galapagos or the drug problem in Colombia.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I had discussions in both countries and I am now suggesting to my colleagues, especially those on the Committee on International Relations chaired by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), that we look at the putting together an initiative, kind of a mini-Marshall Plan that would bring a special focus on the seven contiguous countries around Colombia, to let these countries know that Americans up north are not just in Colombia, Ecuador, Bolivia, Peru and Panama, that we are not just there because of the drug problem, that we want to establish a new relationship, one that encourages more economic investment and encourages real environmental cooperation, one that shows that we will assist them in improving their quality of life in health care and education; and in the end, a strong component that will support the rule of law and support the continued effort to help the Colombian people and the other nations rid themselves of this terrible narcotrafficking and production that has been occurring there over the past several years.

I would hope that one of our objectives in this session of Congress would be to establish this mini-Marshall Plan to show our friends in South America that America wants to be true and close partners of theirs. Ecuador has been one of the closest allies to our country for years. It is time to let the people of Ecuador know that we appreciate that support and that we want to engage with Ecuador in a more aggressive way.

I would hope that our colleagues on the Committee of International Relations led by such great people as the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER), who has traveled to that part of the world more than any of our colleagues, who along with his wife has a better grasp of the situation in Central and South America than many of our people who serve in State Department positions, that we reach out and work with the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER) and his subcommittee and work to shape a new policy, a proactive policy that has a military component but also shows the people of South America that we want to be their true friends and trading partners.

I came away also, Mr. Speaker, from my trip with one additional piece of information dealing with a very controversial subject that will again be taken up by this Congress this year,

and that is the School of the Americas. Every year, Mr. Speaker, when we bring up the defense authorization bill on the floor, there are several Members of Congress who offer an amendment to basically do away with the School of the Americas at Fort Benning, Georgia; and they use the argument that some of the graduates of that school have committed atrocities and have been involved in gross human rights abuses, particularly in Central and South America.

Mr. Speaker, I am not challenging the fact that out of the thousands of people that have gone through the School of the Americas there have been some bad apples, just as I would acknowledge that you can take Harvard University or Yale or Princeton and find one or two graduates who have ended up in jail because of white collar crimes or because of things that they have done that are against our society.

But I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, when I ask the question of the Colombians and the Ecuadorians and our leaders and our two ambassadors in those countries how important is the School of the Americas to your success, the answer was unanimous. The answer was unanimous from everyone I talked to, that the School of the Americas played an absolutely essential role in teaching South and Central American leaders that the military responds to the civilian part of society, that human rights is a part of what a military leader must consider every day he or she is doing their job, that the School of the Americas has trained young military leaders to understand the same types of leadership skills that our military has that are so frequently brought to their attention in serving in our services.

So an additional point that our colleagues need to ask as they travel and deal with the situation in Latin America is how important is this institution to the continued success that we are having in cooperating with the militaries of the South American countries. Are they perfect? The answer is, no. Is our military perfect? The answer is, no. But we are both moving in the same direction, addressing the concerns of human rights and dignity as we enforce laws and as we deal with tyrants and dictators and thugs such as those involved with the FARC and the revolutionary groups that currently are running rampant in Colombia and other parts of South America.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, the news is good. The success is documented, and I rise as someone who was not a big fan of this initiative 6 months ago.

I was a skeptic. I am now convinced we are doing the right thing. Our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, are going to be asked this year to provide a second sum of money to continue this operation. Our colleagues need to get the facts. Our colleagues need to travel to Latin America.

To this end, Mr. Speaker, I will again be organizing a delegation sometime in

the mid to latter part of 2001. I have already received a commitment that Members of Congress will be able to stay overnight in a base camp so they can see firsthand and observe themselves the kind of training, the kind of interaction, can talk to the villagers, and can talk to people who are in the Colombian military to see the success firsthand that we are having.

In Ecuador, we will meet with the leadership. We will also talk about environmental cooperation with pristine areas like the Galapagos. In Colombia and the other countries we visit, we will begin to focus on the success that we are having.

I encourage our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, prior to the vote on these additional funds, to travel to that part of the world. The gentleman from North Carolina (Chairman BALLENGER) takes trips to Central and South America on a regular basis. If our colleagues cannot join the delegation that I organize, they can contact the gentleman from North Carolina (Chairman BALLENGER), and I am sure he will organize an appropriate visit as well this year.

I think in the year 2001, under the leadership of our new President, George Bush, Latin America is the key area of focus; that we must renew old friendships. We must show these people in Central and South America that we are not the ugly gringos of the north, that we want to be their friends. We want to be their trading partners. We want to help them solve their environmental problems. We want to help them in their effort to weed out corruption, to deal with human rights abuses, and to help them provide a solid well-trained military and police force to maintain the basic elements of democracy.

In doing all of that, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced America will be better, our homeland defense will be more secure, and we will have a better relationship with those people who inhabit both Central and South America.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remaining time and thank the Speaker and the staff for sticking through this Special Order.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of the House of Representatives.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of Senate Resolution 105 (adopted April 13, 1989), as amended by Senate Resolution 149 (adopted October 5, 1993), as amended by Public Law 105-275, further amended by Senate Resolution 75 (adopted March 25, 1999), and Senate Resolution 383 (adopted October 27, 2000), the Chair, on behalf of the Democratic

Leader, announces the appointment of the following Senators to serve as members of the Senate National Security Working Group for the One Hundred Seventh Congress—

the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) (Democratic Administrative Co-Chairman);

the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) (Democratic Co-Chairman);

the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) (Democratic Co-Chairman);

the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY);

the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES);

the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY);

the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN);

the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN); and

the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON).

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 94-304, as amended by Public Law 99-7, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senators to the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe—

the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD);

the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM);

the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD); and

the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON).

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 94-304, as amended by Public Law 99-7, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the Senator from Colorado (Mr. CAMPBELL) as Chairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki) during the One Hundred Seventh Congress.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 2761 of title 22, United States Code, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, and upon the recommendation of the Majority Leader, appoints the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) as Chairman of the Senate Delegation to the British-American Interparliamentary Group conference during the One Hundred Seventh Congress.

The message also announced that pursuant to sections 276h-276k of title 22, United States Code, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) as Chairman of the Senate Delegation to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group conference during the One Hundred Seventh Congress.

The message also announced that pursuant to sections 276h-276k of title 22, United States Code, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) as Co-Chairman of the Senate Delegation to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group conference during the One Hundred Seventh Congress.

The message also announced that pursuant to sections 276d-276g of title 22, United States Code, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI) as Chairman of the Senate Delegation to the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group conference during the One Hundred Seventh Congress.

The message also announced that pursuant to sections 276d-276g of title 22, United States Code, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) as Co-Chair of the Senate Delegation to the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group conference during the One Hundred Seventh Congress.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of sections 42 and 43 of title 20, United States Code, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, reappoints the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST) as a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 96-388, as amended by Public Law 97-84 and Public Law 106-292, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, appoints the following Senators to the United States Holocaust Memorial Council—

the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID); and

the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) (re-appointment).

The message also announced that in accordance with sections 1928a-1928d of title 22, United States Code, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) as Co-Chairman of the Senate Delegation to the North Atlantic Assembly during the One Hundred Seventh Congress.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HON. RAY LAHOOD, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOKSEY) laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable RAY LAHOOD, Member of Congress:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 29, 2001.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Office of the Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House, that I have received a subpoena for testimony issued by the Superior Court for the District of Columbia.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that the subpoena is not material and relevant and is not consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

RAY LAHOOD.

COMMUNICATION FROM PRODUCTION OPERATIONS MANAGER OF THE OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Gary J. Denick, production operations manager, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, January 31, 2001.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena for records and testimony issued by the Superior Court for the District of Columbia in the case of *United States v. Armfield*, Case No. M1098200.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

GARY J. DENICK,
Production Operations Manager.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CLAY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHOWS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BAIRD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CLEMENT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. DAVIS of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. SOUDER) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SOUDER, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MURTHA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 18 of the 107th Congress, the House stands adjourned until 2 p.m., Tuesday, February 6, 2001.

Thereupon (at 4 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 18, the House adjourned until Tuesday, February 6, 2001, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

452. A letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendments to the Daily Computation of the Amount of Customer Funds Required to be Segregated (RIN: 3038-AB52) received January 24, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

453. A letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Delegation of Authority to Disclose and Request Information—received January 24, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

454. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Tangelos Grown in Florida and Imported Grapefruit; Clarification of Inspection Requirements [Docket No. FV99-905-5 FR] received January 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

455. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Livestock and Seed Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Regulations Governing the Certification of Sanitary Design and Fabrication of Equipment Used in the Processing of Livestock and Poultry Products [Docket No. LS-98-09] (RIN: 0581-AB69) received January 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

456. A letter from the Executive Vice President, Commodity Credit Corporation, Tobacco and Peanuts Division, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Cleaning and Reinspection of Farmers Stock Peanuts (RIN: 0560-AF56) received January 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

457. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Tart Cherries Grown in the States of Michigan, et al.; Suspension of Provisions under the Federal Marketing Order for Tart Cherries [Docket No. FV00-930-6 IFR] received January 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

458. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Tart Cherries Grown in the States of Michigan, et al.; Decreased Assessment Rates [Docket No. FV01-930-1 IFR] received January 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

459. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Dairy Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Milk in the Northeast and Other Marketing

Areas; Interim Amendment of Orders [Docket No. AO-14-A69, et al; DA-00-03] received January 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

460. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Raisins Produced from Grapes Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV00-989-5 FIR] received January 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

461. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Raisins Produced From Grapes Grown in California; Reduction in Production Cap for 2001 Diversion Program [Docket No. FV01-989-1 IFRA] received January 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

462. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting the National Guard Challenge Program Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2000, required under section 509(k) of title 32, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

463. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on outsourcing and privatization initiatives; to the Committee on Armed Services.

464. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Security and Emergency Operations, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Office of Security and Emergency Operations; Security Requirements for Protected Disclosures Under Section 3164 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 [Docket No. SO-RM-00-3164] (RIN: 1992-AA26) received January 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

465. A letter from the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense, transmitting the annual report to Congress describing the activities of the Defense Production Act Title III Fund for Fiscal Year 2000, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. app. 2094; to the Committee on Financial Services.

466. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket No. FEMA-7753] received January 23, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

467. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Division of Investment Management, Office of Investment Adviser Regulation, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Electronic Filing by Investment Advisers; Amendments to Form ADV; Technical Amendments [Release No. IA-1916; 34-43758; File No. S7-10-00] (RIN: 3235-AI04) received December 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

468. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

469. A letter from the Acting Chief Counsel, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Blocked Persons, Specially Designated Nationals, Specially Designated Terrorists, Foreign Terrorist Organizations, and Specially Designated Narcotics

Traffickers: Additional Designations and Supplementary Information on Specially Designated Narcotics Traffickers—received December 19, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

470. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the semi-annual report on the activities of the Office of the Inspector General and the Secretary's semiannual report on final action taken on Inspector General audits for the period from April 1, 2000 through September 30, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

471. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 13-465, "Capitol Hill Business Improvement District Procedure Amendment Act of 2000" received January 31, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

472. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 13-464, "College Savings Act of 2000" received January 31, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

473. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 13-463, "Approval of the Application for Transfer of Control of District Cablevision, Inc., to AT&T Corporation Act of 2000" received January 31, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

474. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 13-466, "Sentencing Reform Amendment Act of 2000" received January 31, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

475. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 13-418, "Freedom From Cruelty to Animals Protection Amendment Act of 2000" received January 31, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

476. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 13-447, "Retirement Reform Temporary Amendment Act of 2000" received January 31, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

477. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 13-448, "Residential Permit Parking Area Temporary Amendment Act of 2000" received January 31, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

478. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 13-449, "Child Support and Welfare Reform Compliance Temporary Amendment Act of 2000" received January 31, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

479. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 13-457, "Foster Children's Guardianship Temporary Act of 2000" received January 31, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

480. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 13-459, "Motor Vehicle Residential Parking Regulation Amendment Act of 2000" received January 31, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

481. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 13-395, "Distribution of Marijuana Amendment Act of 2000" received January 31, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

482. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 13-460, "Safe Teenage Driving and Merit Personnel Technical Amendment Act of 2000" received January 31, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

483. A letter from the Staff Director, Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting the FY 2000 Federal Managers Financial Integrity Act report, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform.

484. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee For Purchase From People Who Are Blind Or Severely Disabled, transmitting the Committee's final rule—Additions to and Deletions from the Procurement List—received January 19, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

485. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee For Purchase From People Who Are Blind Or Severely Disabled, transmitting the Committee's final rule—Additions to and Deletions from the Procurement List—received January 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

486. A letter from the Chief Financial Officer and Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report on the Strategic Plan for FY 2000-FY 2005; to the Committee on Government Reform.

487. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the FY 2000 Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act Report, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform.

488. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting a report concerning surplus Federal real property disposed of to educational institutions, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 484(o)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

489. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report on Revisions to Final Department of Transportation FY 2001 Performance Plan; to the Committee on Government Reform.

490. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Acquisition Regulation: Type of Contracts [FRL-6932-7] received January 9, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

491. A letter from the Acting Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform.

492. A letter from the Director, Office of General Counsel and Legal Policy, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting the Office's final rule—Technical Amendments to Office of Government Ethics Freedom of Information Act Regulation: Change in Decisional Officials—received January 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

493. A letter from the Deputy Director for Management, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a report entitled, "Electronic Purchasing and Payment in the Federal Government—Update 2000"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

494. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule—Excepted Service; Career

and Career-Conditional Employment (RIN: 3206-AJ28) received December 19, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

495. A letter from the Chief Operating Officer, U.S. Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board, transmitting a report on the Annual Performance Plan for FY 2001; to the Committee on Government Reform.

496. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—The Argo Project: Global ocean observations for understanding and prediction of climate variability [Docket No. 001027300-0300-01] (RIN: 0648-ZA96) received December 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

497. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Commercial Quota Harvested for North Carolina [Docket No. 000119014-0137-02; I.D. 121200H] received January 9, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

498. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report for the lower Delaware River and several of its tributaries in Pennsylvania and New Jersey, in response to the provisions of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, Public Law 90-542, as amended; to the Committee on Resources.

499. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report for the lower Sheenjek River in Alaska, in response to the provisions of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, Public Law 90-542, as amended; to the Committee on Resources.

500. A letter from the Director, Policy Directives and Instructions Branch, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule—Additional Authorization To Issue Certifications for Foreign Health Care Workers; Speech-Language Pathologists and Audiologists, Medical Technologists and Technicians, and Physician Assistants [INS No. 2089-00] (RIN: 1115-AE73) received January 29, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

501. A letter from the Director, Policy Directives and Instructions Branch, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule—Clarification of Parole Authority [INS No. 2004-99] (RIN: 1115-AF53) received January 29, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

502. A letter from the Director, Policy Directives and Instructions Branch, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule—Temporary Protected Status: Amendments to the Requirements for Employment Authorization Fee, and Other Technical Amendments [INS No. 1972-99] (RIN: 1115-AF01) received January 29, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

503. A letter from the Director, Policy Directives and Instructions Branch, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule—Update of the List of Countries Whose Citizens or Nationals Are Ineligible for Transit Without Visa (TWOV) Privileges to the United States Under the TWOV Program [INS No. 2020-99] (RIN: 1115-AF81) received January 29, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

504. A letter from the Director, Policy Directives and Instructions Branch, Immigra-

tion and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule—Removing Burma From the Guam Visa Waiver Program [INS No. 2099-00] (RIN: 1115-AF95) received January 29, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

505. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-377-AD; Amendment 39-12014; AD 2000-24-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 8, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

506. A letter from the Regulations Officer, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Mitigation of Impacts to Wetlands and Natural Habitat [FHWA Docket No. FHWA 97-2514; 96-8] (RIN: 2125-AD78) received January 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

507. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Effluent Limitations Guidelines, Pretreatment Standards, and New Source Performance Standards for the Commercial Hazardous Waste Combustor Subcategory of the Waste Combustors Point Source Category; Correction [FRL-6866-7] (RIN: 2040-AC23) received January 29, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

508. A letter from the Chairman, Office of Economics, Environmental Analysis, and Administration, Surface Transportation Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Modification of the Class I Reporting Regulations [STB Ex Parte No. 583] received January 9, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

509. A letter from the the Director, National Legislative Commission, The American Legion, transmitting the proceedings of the 82nd National Convention of the American Legion, held in Milwaukee, Wisconsin from September 5, 6, and 7, 2000 as well as a report on the Organization's activities for the year preceding the Convention, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 49; (H. Doc. No. 107-37); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed.

510. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, Customs Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Technical Amendments to the Customs Regulations [T.D. 01-14] received January 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

511. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Closing agreements [Rev. Proc. 2001-17] received January 29, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

512. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Appeals Settlement Guidelines: Health Insurance Deductibility for Self-Employed Individuals—received January 29, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

513. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Appeals Settlement Guidelines: Retroactive Adoption Of An Accidental And Health Plan—received January 29, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

514. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting

the Service's final rule—Changes in accounting periods and in methods of accounting [Rev. Proc. 2001-24] received January 29, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

515. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Action On Decision: Security State Bank v. Commissioner—received January 29, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

516. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Appeals Settlement Guidelines: Retroactive Adoption of an Accident and Health Plan—received January 24, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

517. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Appeals Settlement Guidelines: Health Insurance Deductibility for Self-Employed Individuals—received January 24, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

518. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Closing agreements [Rev. Proc. 2001-22] received January 23, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

519. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Rules and regulations [Rev. Proc. 2001-21] received January 23, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

520. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Contingent Liability Tax Shelter [Notice 2001-17] received January 23, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

521. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Intermediary Transactions Tax Shelter [Notice 2001-16] received January 23, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

522. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Timely Mailing Treated as Timely Filing/Electronic Postmark [TD 8932] (RIN: 1545-AW81) received January 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

523. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Disclosure of Returns and Return Information to Designee of Taxpayer [TD 8935] (RIN: 1545-AY59) received January 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

524. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Conversion to the Euro [TD 8927] (RIN: 1545-AW34) received January 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

525. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the USDA 1997-1999 activities report on environmental assessment, restoration, and cleanup activities required by Section 120(e)(5) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act; jointly to the Committees on Agriculture and Energy and Commerce.

526. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting an update regarding the

Department of Housing and Urban Development's 2020 Management Reform efforts that have changed HUD for the better and the semi-annual report of the Inspector General for the period ending September 30, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); jointly to the Committees on Financial Services and Government Reform.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MANZULLO (for himself, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. ENGLISH, Mrs. THURMAN, and Mr. GRAVES):

H.R. 317. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for 100 percent of the health insurance costs of self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. BORSKI):

H.R. 318. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a uniform dollar limitation for all types of transportation fringe benefits excludable from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALLEN:

H.R. 319. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide an exception to the nine-month duration of marriage requirement for widows and widowers in cases in which the marriage was postponed by legal impediments to the marriage caused by State restrictions on divorce from a prior spouse institutionalized due to mental incompetence or similar incapacity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVANS (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SHOWS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. REYES, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BALDACCIO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. COYNE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. FROST, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. TANNER, Mr. WU, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. WYNN, Mr. DICKS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MAS-CARA, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. OLVER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. SANDLIN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. WEINER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MATSUI, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. FRANK, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. THURMAN, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. BOSWELL, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. SNYDER, Ms.

ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut):

H.R. 320. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve benefits under the Montgomery GI Bill by establishing an enhanced educational assistance program, by increasing the amount of basic educational assistance, by repealing the requirement for reduction in pay for participation in the program, by authorizing the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make accelerated payments of basic educational assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JACKSON of Illinois:

H.R. 321. A bill to assure protection for the substantive due process rights of the innocent, by providing a temporary moratorium on carrying out of the death penalty to assure that persons able to prove their innocence are not executed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAIRD (for himself and Mr. CLEMENT):

H.R. 322. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for State sales taxes in lieu of State and local income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BECERRA:

H.R. 323. A bill to amend the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Act to include public libraries; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BOEHLERT:

H.R. 324. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to promote brownfields redevelopment, to reauthorize and reform the Superfund program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TANNER (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. JOHN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. SEXTON, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BOYD, and Mr. CLEMENT):

H.R. 325. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish a program for fisheries habitat protection, restoration, and enhancement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MINK of Hawaii (for herself, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. WYNN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. WEINER, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. McNULTY, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. FILNER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SANDLIN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. OWENS, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr.

DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. DELAUNO, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. MICA, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. RIVERS, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. WU, Ms. LEE, Mr. FROST, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Ms. ESHOO;

H.R. 326. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for programs regarding ovarian cancer; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H.R. 327. A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, for the purpose of facilitating compliance by small businesses with certain Federal paperwork requirements and to establish a task force to examine the feasibility of streamlining paperwork requirements applicable to small businesses; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.R. 328. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to exempt from inspection certain small passenger vessels that operate in waters of the United States only in the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CLEMENT (for himself, Mr. FORD, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. WAMP, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. JENKINS, and Mr. TANNER):

H.R. 329. A bill to authorize the establishment of a suboffice of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in Nashville, Tennessee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COX (for himself, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARCHIA, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BASS, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BONILLA, Mrs. BONO, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BUYER, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRANE, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. DELAY, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DREIER, Mr. DUNCAN, Ms. DUNN, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GOODE, Mr. GOSS, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. GRUCCI, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HANSEN, Ms. HART, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. HORN, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. HYDE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. KING, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. LINDER, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr.

McHUGH, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. McKEON, Mr. MICA, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. NEY, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. OSE, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. PITTS, Mr. POMBO, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. RILEY, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. SCHAFER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. UPTON, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. WILSON, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska);

H.R. 330. A bill to repeal the Federal estate and gift taxes and the tax on generation-skipping transfers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM (for himself, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PAUL, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. GARY MILLER of California):

H.R. 331. A bill to provide that the Davis-Bacon Act shall not apply to contracts for the construction and repair of schools and libraries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 332. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to improve consumers' access to airline industry information, to promote competition in the aviation industry, to protect airline passenger rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GEKAS (for himself, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. BEREUTER, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BUYER, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. DREIER, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FROST, Mr. GOODE, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LINDER, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. OXLEY, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. SWEENEY, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WELDON of Florida, and Mr. WELLER):

H.R. 333. A bill to amend title 11, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by

the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 334. A bill to increase burdensharing for the United States military presence in the Persian Gulf region; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DEMINT (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. SCHAFER, and Mr. GOODE):

H.R. 335. A bill to provide for the establishment of a commission to review and make recommendations to Congress on the reform and simplification of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOYLE (for himself, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COYNE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. MURTHA, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 336. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to enhance outreach programs carried out by the Department of Veterans Affairs to provide for more fully informing eligible surviving spouses and dependents of deceased veterans of benefits available to them under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and to improve assistance provided at local levels by providing for staff with specific responsibilities to assist those individuals in obtaining benefits under those laws; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. EMERSON (for herself and Mr. BERRY):

H.R. 337. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to increase the maximum amount of marketing loan gains and loan deficiency payments that an agricultural producer may receive during the 2001 crop year; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. EMERSON (for herself and Mr. BERRY):

H.R. 338. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to increase the maximum amount of marketing loan gains and loan deficiency payments that an agricultural producer may receive during each of crop years 2001 and 2002; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. FROST, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. WEINER, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. McNULTY):

H.R. 339. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of outpatient prescription drugs under part B of the Medicare Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FROST, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HOLT, Mr. KIND, Mr. KUCINICH, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. NADLER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. REYES,

Mr. RUSH, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. SCOTT, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. STARK, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 340. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to improve the quality of public education and raise student achievement by increasing investment, strengthening accountability, raising standards for teachers, improving professional development and teacher compensation, rewarding successful schools, and providing better information to parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FORD:

H.R. 341. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to authorize school construction funds for local educational agencies that have made improvements in teacher quality and student achievement; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FORD:

H.R. 342. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make higher education more affordable by providing a full tax deduction for higher education expenses and interest on student loans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRANK:

H.R. 343. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the forgiveness of Perkins loans to members of the armed services on active duty; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FRANK:

H.R. 344. A bill to amend titles II and XVIII of the Social Security Act to eliminate the 5-month waiting period which is presently required in order for an individual to be eligible for benefits based on disability or for the disability freeze and to eliminate the 24-month waiting period for disabled individuals to become eligible for Medicare benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROEMER (for himself, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. KIND, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mrs. TAUSCHER):

H.R. 345. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, to reauthorize and make improvements to that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 346. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for the use of unexpended universal service funds in low-income schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 347. A bill to require the Federal Trade Commission to prescribe regulations to protect the privacy of personal information collected from and about individuals on the Internet, to provide greater individual control over the collection and use of that information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GUTIERREZ:

H.R. 348. A bill to amend the Nicaraguan Adjustment and Central American Relief Act

to provide to certain nationals of El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Haiti an opportunity to apply for adjustment of status under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYWORTH:

H.R. 349. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide competitive civil service status for National Guard technicians who are involuntarily separated other than for cause from National Guard service; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. HEFLEY:

H.R. 350. A bill to establish certain requirements relating to the acquisition, transfer, or disposal of public lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. HEFLEY:

H.R. 351. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend to civilian employees of the Department of Defense serving in combat zones the tax treatment allowed to members of the Armed Forces serving in combat zones; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEFLEY:

H.R. 352. A bill to establish certain privileges and immunities for information disclosed as part of a voluntary self-evaluation of compliance with environmental requirements, relating to compliance with environmental laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, Agriculture, and Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HOEKSTRA (for himself, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. PAUL, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. SHAD-EGG, Mr. TANCREDO, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. PITTS, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. UPTON, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. DELAY, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. COLLINS):

H.R. 353. A bill to require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a comprehensive fraud audit of the Department of Education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mr. GOODLATTE):

H.R. 354. A bill to establish a grant program to assist State and local governments with improving the administration of elections through activities which may include the modernization of voting procedures and equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina (for himself and Mr. HOSTETTLER):

H.R. 355. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to nonprofit organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. HANSEN):

H.R. 356. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that a member of the uniformed services shall be treated as using a principal residence while away from home on qualified official extended duty in determining the exclusion of gain from the sale of such residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island (for himself and Ms. BROWN of Florida):

H.R. 357. A bill to adjust the immigration status of certain Liberian nationals who were provided refuge in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island (for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts):

H.R. 358. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor in Massachusetts and Rhode Island, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. KOLBE:

H.R. 359. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to set aside up to \$2 per person from park entrance fees or assess up to \$2 per person visiting the Grand Canyon National Park and certain other units of the National Park System to secure bonds for capital improvements to these parks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 360. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a program of research regarding the risks posed by the presence of dioxin, synthetic fibers, and other additives in feminine hygiene products, and to establish a program for the collection and analysis of data on toxic shock syndrome; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself and Mr. GREENWOOD):

H.R. 361. A bill to provide for international family planning funding for the fiscal year 2002, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri (for herself, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. MOORE, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. GRAVES):

H.R. 362. A bill to ensure that law enforcement agencies determine, before the release or transfer of a person, whether that person has an outstanding charge or warrant, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McNULTY:

H.R. 363. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to grant the State of New York authority to allow tandem trailers to use Interstate Route 787 between the New York State Thruway and Church Street in Albany, New York; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. MEEK of Florida (for herself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 364. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5927 Southwest 70th Street in Miami, Florida, as the "Marjory Williams Scrivens Post Office"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. MOORE (for himself, Mr. FROST, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. ROSS):

H.R. 365. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to require persons making certain campaign-related telephone calls to disclose the identification of the person financing the call, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MOORE (for himself and Mr. FROST):

H.R. 366. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make unlawful the knowing dissemination of false information regarding elections for Federal office with the intent of discouraging another person from voting; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 367. A bill to promote the health and safety of children by requiring the posting of Consumer Product Safety Commission child care center safety standards in child care

centers and by requiring that the Secretary of Health and Human Services report to Congress with recommendations to promote compliance with such standards; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. NORWOOD, and Mr. SCHAFER):

H.R. 368. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals a credit against income tax for tuition and related expenses for public and nonpublic elementary and secondary education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ISAKSON, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. SCHAFER, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. UPTON):

H.R. 369. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit for elementary and secondary school teachers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. NORWOOD):

H.R. 370. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for amounts contributed to charitable organizations which provide elementary or secondary scholarships and for contributions of, and for, instructional materials and materials for extracurricular activities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. RIVERS:

H.R. 371. A bill to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act relating to the minimum amount of State grants for any fiscal year under part B of that Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. RIVERS:

H.R. 372. A bill to prevent Members of Congress from receiving any automatic pay adjustment which might otherwise take effect in 2002; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan (for himself, Mr. GRUCCI, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, and Mr. AKIN):

H.R. 373. A bill to amend the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001 to protect Social Security surpluses; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 374. A bill to establish a National Commission to Eliminate Waste in Government; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. ROHRBACHER):

H.R. 375. A bill to dismantle the Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Financial Services, International Relations, Armed Services, Ways and Means, Government Reform, the Judiciary, Science,

and Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 376. A bill to abolish the Department of Energy; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Science, Government Reform, Rules, and Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 377. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide additional incentives for the use of clean-fuel vehicles by businesses within empowerment zones, enterprise communities, and renewal communities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 378. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for designation of overpayments and contributions to the United States Library Trust Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SHAW (for himself, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. PETRI):

H.R. 379. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow issuance of tax-exempt private activity bonds to finance public-private partnership activities relating to school facilities in public elementary and secondary schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHAYS (for himself, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. WAMP, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. HORN, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. FARR of California, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. HOYER, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. STENHOLM, Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. FRANK, Mr. BASS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. GILLMOR, Ms. RIVERS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. LEACH, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. TURNER, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. BARRETT, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. WALSH, Mr. KIND, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. OSE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. STARK, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. HOLT, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. KLECZKA, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. MOORE, Mr. BORSKI, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms.

ESHOO, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. WEINER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. FILNER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. COYNE, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. EVANS, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. WU, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. GORDON, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. REYES, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ROSS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BERRY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. SAWYER, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. SAXTON, Ms. LOFGREN, and Ms. DEGETTE):

H.R. 380. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reform the financing of campaigns for elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Government Reform, the Judiciary, Ways and Means, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STEARNS:

H.R. 381. A bill to prospectively repeal section 210 of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself, Mr.

BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. HOLDEN, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BARCIA, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington):

H.R. 382. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a national standard in accordance with which nonresidents of a State may carry certain concealed firearms in the State, and to exempt qualified current and former law enforcement officers from State laws prohibiting the carrying of concealed handguns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself and Mr. SCHAFER):

H.R. 383. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for amounts paid for health insurance and prescription drug costs of individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H.R. 384. A bill to establish a national policy of basic consumer fair treatment for airline passengers; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. TANCREDO (for himself, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. RIVERS, and Mr. RYUN of Kansas):

H.R. 385. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide for parental notification and consent prior to enrollment of a child in a bilingual education program or a special alternative instructional program for limited English proficient students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 386. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to orphan drugs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WEINER:

H.R. 387. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the child tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEINER:

H.R. 388. A bill to amend the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 to extend energy assistance to households headed by certain senior citizens; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WEINER (for himself, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FROST, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 389. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, to require coverage for the treatment of infertility; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WEINER:

H.R. 390. A bill to require the establishment of regional consumer price indices to compute cost-of-living increases under the programs for Social Security and Medicare and other medical benefits under titles II and XVIII of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 391. A bill to require foreign countries to meet certain requirements relating to political freedom, transparency, accountability, and good governance in order to be eligible to receive cancellation or reduction of debt owed to the United States; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COX (for himself, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. DELAY, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BASS, Mr. BEREUTER, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BONILLA, Mrs. BONO, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BUYER, Mr. CALAHAN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CANTOR, Ms. CAPITO, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. CRANE, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. THOMAS M. Davis of Virginia, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DREIER, Mr. DUNCAN, Ms.

DUNN, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. EHRLICH, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GOODE, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GOSS, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. GRUCCI, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. HANSEN, Ms. HART, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HORN, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. HYDE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. ISSA, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. JENKINS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. KELLER, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. KERNS, Mr. KING, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KIRK, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. LINDER, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MICA, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mrs. MORELLA, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. NEY, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. OSE, Mr. OTTER, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. POMBO, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. QUINN, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. REGULA, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. RILEY, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. SCHAFER, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UPTON, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WELLER, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. WILSON, Mr. WOLF, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida):

H.J. Res. 7. A joint resolution recognizing the 90th birthday of Ronald Reagan; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. JENKINS (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. GOODE, Mr. LARGENT, Ms. HART, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. CASTLE, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. SCHAFER, and Mr. TERRY):

H.J. Res. 8. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitu-

tion of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEY:

H. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MOORE (for himself and Mr. STENHOLM):

H. Con. Res. 19. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that future budget resolutions should maintain our commitment to fiscal responsibility by using agreed-upon surplus, tax, and spending figures; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. FROST, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. WOLF, Mrs. KELLY, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. LARGENT, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BORSKI, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. KUCINICH, Mrs. THURMAN, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. KING, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio):

H. Con. Res. 20. Concurrent resolution expressing support for the goals of Veterans Educate Today's Students (VETS) Day, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BONILLA:

H. Res. 24. A resolution designating majority membership on certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. FROST:

H. Res. 25. A resolution designating minority membership on certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BALDACCIO (for himself and Mrs. EMERSON):

H. Res. 26. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the disparity between identical prescription drugs sold in the United States, Canada, and Mexico; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H. Res. 27. A resolution strongly urging the President to file a complaint at the World Trade Organization against oil-producing countries for violating trade rules that prohibit quantitative limitations on the import or export of resources or products across borders; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN:

H.R. 392. A bill for the relief of Nancy B. Wilson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CUBIN:

H.R. 393. A bill for the relief of Ashley Ross Fuller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 42: Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. HAYES, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HEFLEY, and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

H.R. 43: Mr. ENGLISH and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 79: Mr. ETHERIDGE.

H.R. 80: Mr. LAHOOD and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 99: Mr. PAUL, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. CRANE, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 103: Mr. PAUL and Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 105: Mr. PAUL, Mr. HEFLEY, and Mr. SCHAFFER.

H.R. 123: Mr. SCHAFFER and Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 144: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 145: Mr. HILLIARD.

H.R. 147: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. HART, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. WYNN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. HILLIARD.

H.R. 148: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SANDLIN, and Mr. BALDACCIO.

H.R. 154: Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. MOORE, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. KING, Mr. PAUL, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. FROST, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. DOOLEY

of California, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. PITTS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SIMMONS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. KIND, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Ms. HART, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BAIRD, Mrs. KELLY, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.

H.R. 161: Mr. SWEENEY.

H.R. 166: Mrs. BONO, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 167: Mr. PAUL, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 169: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 179: Mr. COLLINS, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. McNULTY.

H.R. 190: Mr. GOODE, Mr. CALLAHAN, and Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 220: Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 236: Mr. HORN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. POMBO, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. KING, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. VITTER, Mr. GANSKE, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. WOLF, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. COX, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. WAMP, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. HASTINGS of

Washington, Mrs. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CRANE, Mr. STEARNS, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. GILCHREST.

H.R. 238: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD and Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 245: Mr. MASCARA.

H.R. 267: Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. REYNOLDS, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 279: Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 311: Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. KOLBE, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. LATOURETTE, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. PITTS, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BALLENGER, and Mr. KING.

H. Con. Res. 4: Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. QUINN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KING, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. HART, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. KING, and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

H. Con. Res. 15: Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H. Res. 11: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.

H. Res. 17: Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. DEFazio, and Mr. FRANK.